

AN EXAMINATION
of the
PROPOSED
DOCTRINAL AFFIRMATION



By
THEO. DIERKS, S.T.D.

AN EXAMINATION
of the
PROPOSED
DOCTRINAL AFFIRMATION



By
THEO. DIERKS, S.T.D.

Are You Studying the Doctrinal Affirmation?

A CAREFUL ANALYSIS

reveals much ambiguity, weakness of confession, insufficient rejection of error, compromising statements. We should be fully prepared to demand a clear confession of faith to establish unity before considering union with any church body not now in fellowship with us.

THE PRESENT DOCUMENT

is not a clear and sharply defined, adequate confession of faith, leaves room for views which have rightly been barred by the Brief Statement, discards the Brief Statement's clear confession of the inspiration and infallibility of every word of Scripture, leaves room for a false doctrine of conversion, introduces false doctrine in regard to the election of grace, does not bar false doctrine in regard to the object and effect of the Lord's Supper, permits the false doctrine of a visible side of the Church when defining its essence, removes the Scriptural bar to unionism, particularly allows churches to disagree in non-fundamental doctrines, does not reject all forms of chiliasm, as Scripture does, does not take a definite position in the doctrine of the Antichrist, permits un-Scriptural doctrine regarding the conversion of the Jews, does not reject false doctrine concerning the resurrection of martyrs.

It subverts the Scriptural position of the Missouri Synod.

IT MUST BE REJECTED!

In the earnest hope and prayer that you together with all members of the Synodical Conference will submit the Doctrinal Affirmation to a searching examination and a scrutinizing study, this little book is being sent to you under the auspices of a number of brethren meeting in Chicago to study the Affirmation. May it serve you as an aid in your study of this document, which has been submitted to us for that purpose.

Dr. Behnken, on the eve of his departure for Europe, requested the sponsors of "A Statement" to withhold the same until after his return, so that he might examine and discuss it with them. He addressed a similar request to the sponsors of this brochure, which request was granted before its publication.

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	7
Early Efforts Towards Union.....	7
The Differences Remain.....	8
Iowa's Dogmatics	9
Missouri Seeks Clarification	10
The Affirmation Cannot Stand Alone	11
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.....	13
The So-called Dictation Theory.....	13
An Illustration Not a Theory.....	15
False Emphasis on Human Side of Scripture.....	16
The Bible—A History of Revelation?.....	17
"The Written Record of Revelation".....	18
Luther and the Scriptures.....	20
Iowa's Verbal Inspiration.....	21
Infallibility of Every Word—Lost.....	23
The Affirmation on Inspiration.....	24
Iowa's Peculiar "Rule of Faith".....	26
OF CONVERSION	28
Missouri Never Taught "Irresistible Grace".....	28
Iowa's False Doctrine of Conversion.....	30
OF THE MEANS OF GRACE.....	32
The Word of the Gospel.....	32
The Object of the Lord's Supper.....	33
OF THE CHURCH.....	36
"The Visible Side of the Church" (?).....	36
The Office of the Ministry.....	37
Unionism	38
A.L.C. on Unionism.....	39
Missouri's Position Rejected.....	40
The Brief Statement on Unionism.....	42
OF THE ELECTION OF GRACE.....	43
Election in View of Faith.....	43
The Chicago Theses.....	44
Iowa's Doctrine of Predestination.....	46
False Doctrine of Conversion Safeguarded.....	47
Affirmation Insists on Harmonizing.....	48
A Strange View of Election.....	49
OF THE LAST THINGS.....	51
Missouri Rejects Iowa's Chiliasm.....	51
Does A.L.C. Declaration Reject Chiliasm?.....	52
The Question of Non-Fundamentals.....	52
Which Types of Chiliasm are Rejected?.....	53
The Thousand Years	55
The Antichrist—The Pope	56
The Conversion of Israel.....	57
Resurrection of Martyrs	58
Resurrection of the Saints on Easter Morning.....	59
CONCLUSION	61
How to Heal the Schism.....	62
Our Plea	63

THE LUTHERAN WAY

How the Formula of Concord was originally subscribed and how it was submitted to others for subscription

"Since now, in the sight of God and of all Christendom, we wish to testify to those now living and those who shall come after us that this declaration herewith presented concerning all the controverted articles aforementioned and explained, and no other, is our faith, doctrine and confession, in which we are also willing, by God's grace, to appear with intrepid hearts before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, and give an account of it; and that we will neither privately nor publicly speak or write anything contrary to it, but, by the help of God's grace, intend to abide thereby: therefore, after mature deliberation, we have, in God's fear and with the invocation of His name, attached our signature with our own hands" (Triglotta, p. 1103).

"No one was forced to subscribe by threatenings, no one was enticed to do this by promises, no one was unexpectedly hurried into doing so and brow-beaten. Everyone was rather asked to examine the confession and fearlessly to express his possible misgivings; and those who did this were not only instructed in a friendly and thorough manner, but they were also given time to consider the matter if this was desired. There was so little thought of obtaining subscriptions by coercion, that those of whom it became evident that they believed differently were rather not permitted to subscribe at all. Neither was anyone who could and would subscribe only conditionally and with some reservation permitted to do this; wherefore no one was permitted to subscribe anything more than his mere name. An honest subscription was desired . . . Elector Frederick of Brandenburg had given his commission instructions in which, among others, the following words occur: 'That they should **talk no one into** subscribing, but that they should rather **dissuade** those who might have some scruples and not permit them to subscribe until they had previously been fully instructed in the divine truth and their consciences had been perfectly satisfied'" (Walther, "The Formula of Concord," 1877, p. 71.73).

From letters addressed to the author

Dr. P. E. Kretzmann—Professor at Concordia Seminary—"There are two Scripture passages which compel every conscientious Lutheran to make a careful study of the Doctrinal Affirmation, namely, 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good' (I Thess. 5:21), and 'We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth' (II Cor. 13:8). All who are praying and working for true Lutheran unity will be guided by these principles . . . I find myself in full agreement with the entire ductus of your arguments."

Dr. M. F. Kretzmann—Secretary of the Missouri Synod—"I think you have made it clear that the Doctrinal Affirmation does not clearly set forth our position over against the teachings of the Iowa Synod and the American Lutheran Church as such . . . The tone of your paper is certainly modest and humble and I do not see why anyone should misunderstand your motives."

Dr. Marcus Wagner—Pastor at Forest Park, Ill.—"Your exquisite 'Examination' is in fact a most serviceable elucidation. This matter of the 'Affirmation'

and its implied possibilities and consequences is of the utmost importance and all possible information ought to be available to all concerned. I am confident that your 'Examination' will be much appreciated by all brethren, and love for the truth demands that we fearlessly confess it before men."

Dr. J. F. Boerger, Sr.—Pastor at Racine, Wis.—"Have now read your 'Examination' the third time. With your 'Introduction' every informed Missourian pastor must agree. The body of your paper is thoroughgoing and well documented, truthful and objective, following the principle laid down by Dr. Walther in the words, 'Dear as the unity of the Church is to us, the truth and our salvation must be even dearer to us,' and that expressed by Dr. Krauth in the words, 'Truthful separation is far better than dishonest union.' I fully agree with your 'Conclusion.'"

W. Albrecht—Professor at Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Ill.—"Concern for the truth and insistence on a clear and correct confession will augur well for the second century of our Synod, but indifference and false irenics will insure our spiritual decay. Does the 'Affirmation' express our old Lutheran faith correctly and exactly? Are truth and error granted equal suffrage? Is a path to unionism being opened? Every true Lutheran will want to know the answer to these and other questions. Here your well-documented 'Examination' can serve him well."

Dr. E. T. Lams—Former President of the Northern Illinois District—"A thorough study of the so-called 'Doctrinal Affirmation' will clearly reveal that instead of affirming Scriptural truth it makes room for its denial and contrary error. Unqualified subscription to our 'Brief Statement' should be demanded as a condition of membership within the Missouri Synod and for fellowship with other Lutheran bodies not now within the Synodical Conference."

INTRODUCTION

(We had hoped to keep the matter of the Doctrinal Affirmation's defects from becoming a public controversy. We offered to meet members of the Committee on Doctrinal Unity privately with our objections before the document was published. It was no fault of ours that such a meeting was not held.—T. D.)

Christ does not desire His Church to be rent and torn asunder by contentions and strifes. Paul therefore admonishes, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no schism among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (I Cor. 1:10). Woe unto him who causes a schism within the Church of Christ by corrupting or denying the truth of God's Word! Woe unto him who hinders the healing of a schism by acting contrary to the Word of God! But woe also unto him who in order to heal a schism compromises even one jot or tittle of that Word!

When the fathers of the Missouri Synod raised the banner of true Lutheranism in this country, they were called, as Walther says, by every name except that which they wanted to be known by—Lutherans. As a result those early "Missourians" had to search the writings of Luther, the Lutheran Confessions, as well as the works of the great Lutheran dogmaticians in order to prove to all the world that they really were what they professed to be—confessors of the doctrine of the Reformation, Lutherans. However, by thus upholding and proclaiming the Lutheran theology of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries they soon came in conflict with the so-called Nineteenth century positive Lutheran theology of Germany, represented in this country primarily by Wartburg Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. The differences between these two theologies soon revealed themselves and were clearly defined through public controversies, and though many efforts were made in the last decades to harmonize and reconcile these two conflicting theologies all such efforts came to naught. The schism was not healed.

EARLY EFFORTS TOWARD UNION

Why did these efforts fail? In 1929 the "Examining Committee for Intersynodical Theses" asked Synod to reject the so-called Chicago Theses "since all chapters and a number of paragraphs are inadequate. At times they do not touch upon the point of controversy; at times they are so phrased that both parties can find in them their own opinion; at times they incline more to the position of our opponents than our own" (Proceedings, 1929, p. 110). That the "Examining Committee" was correct in its criticism is proved by the fact that the official copies of the Chicago Theses sent to the pastors of the Ohio and the Iowa Synods had certain expressions in bold type so that it was impossible for them to miss the intended sense. After examining the report of the "Intersynodical Committee" and the report of the "Examining Committee"

Committee 19 recommended "that Synod do not accept the theses in their present form, for the following reasons: (a) Because many serious objections have been raised by members of Synod, which, in our opinion, should be carefully considered and eventually be taken into account in any further work concerning the theses; (b) Because the omission of all historical data in working out the theses was evidently not conducive to a full understanding on the part of the colloquents. We must begin with the *status controversiae*." Our Synod adopted this recommendation and specifically added, "That future deliberations proceed from the exact point of controversy and take into account the pertinent history" (Proceedings, 1929, p. 112f).

In 1938 the American Lutheran Church declared at Sandusky that it regarded "the Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod, together with the Declaration of our Commission, a sufficient doctrinal basis for church-fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church" and stated furthermore, "We believe that the Brief Statement viewed in the light of our Declaration is not in contradiction to the Minneapolis Theses" (C.T.M., 1939, p. 59f). Asked by our committee, to explain the phrase "viewed in the light of," the American Lutheran Church declared at Detroit in 1940, "This phrase says three things: 1. In regard to the question concerning the essence of the Church, the Antichrist, the conversion of the Jews, the physical resurrection of the martyrs, and the reign of a thousand years mentioned in Rev. 20 we accept the 'Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod' only with the limitations set forth in our Declaration. 2. In regard to the other points mentioned in our Declaration we accept the corresponding points of doctrine in the Brief Statement as they are either 'supplemented' in our Declaration or 'emphasized as to those points which seemed essential to us.' Thus the doctrine of the Holy Scripture has been supplemented in our Declaration with reference to the human factor, and in the doctrines of Election and Conversion those points have been emphasized which seemed essential to us. 3. In regard to the Brief Statement in general this phrase intends to say that we are conscious of our agreement with 'the points of doctrine' contained therein, without, however, on our part sharing the exegetical or other lines of argumentation in every case and without feeling obligated in every case to employ the same terminology" (C.T.M., 1940, p. 932). Thereby the American Lutheran Church publicly acknowledged that it did not subscribe to the Brief Statement in every point, that it had supplemented the Brief Statement, or had emphasized those points which seemed essential to it, others being unessential.

THE DIFFERENCES REMAIN

That the old differences remained is proved by the fact that even after the Brief Statement and the Declaration had been adopted by the American Lutheran Church the same teaching against which our fathers contended these many years was still publicly taught at Wartburg Seminary by Dr. Reu, the chief author of the Declaration. The only plausible and charitable explanation of this fact is that Dr. Reu went as far as he could go in order to meet the Missourians without entirely rejecting the theology which had always been taught at Wart-

burg Seminary, and that this peculiar theology is contained in, and perpetuated by, the peculiar language of the Declaration. Common sense will compel us to seek the true meaning of the Declaration in the writings of its chief author. Even in judging the correct interpretation of a certain law our judges take into consideration the preceding discussion of our law-makers. Besides, this method of seeking the true meaning of a public document is also thoroughly Lutheran; for the Formula of Concord says, "Since Dr. Luther is to be regarded as the most distinguished teacher of the churches which confess the Augsburg Confession . . . the proper meaning and sense of the oft-mentioned Augsburg Confession can and should be derived from no other source more properly and correctly than from the doctrinal and polemical writings of Dr. Luther" (Triglot., p. 985).

IOWA'S DOGMATICS

We would call our reader's attention to the 1928 edition and to the 1941-42 edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics" which was Dr. Reu's mimeographed text-book in his class-room these many years. It has been maintained that "Lutheran Dogmatics" merely presents Dr. Reu's private views which his students were at liberty to accept or reject. Now it is true, Dr. Reu says in regard to his peculiar views on Chiliasm, "Not a few of the points discussed in this chapter pertain to the realm of open questions, i.e., questions which need not disrupt church-fellowship. . . . The term conveys the idea that on the one hand one may be a member of the Lutheran Church and yet reject the above-given presentation of the preliminary perfection, and that on the other hand he must be recognized as Lutheran who feels that his conscience is bound by the Scripture texts and therefore defends and upholds the views presented in this chapter" (1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 246; 1928 ed., p. 317f). However, we are certain that it would be an injustice to Dr. Reu even to imagine that he took such a position in regard to the fundamental doctrines, e.g. of Scripture, or of Conversion and Election. We do not believe that Dr. Reu would have permitted his students to put a question-mark behind his whole theology. Furthermore, it has been maintained that the Declaration supersedes Dr. Reu's Lutheran Dogmatics. That this is simply not true is proved by the fact that the 1941-42 edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics" corrects the English translation of the Declaration (cf. Vol. II, p. 142f: "It must be maintained, not, indeed, 'with equal emphasis'—that is an incorrect translation in the 'Declaration' of the American Lutheran Church accepted 1938 at Sandusky—but 'with equal seriousness' (mit gleichem Ernst) as the original German text had it"). Finally, it has been contended that the Declaration represents the position endorsed by the American Lutheran Church, while in "Lutheran Dogmatics" we have merely the private opinions of an individual. In answer we would say that Dr. Reu was the chief representative of the A.L.C. commission, that he was the chief author of the Declaration, and that he has been the leading teacher within the American Lutheran Church these many years. Dr. Reu's "In the Interest of Lutheran Unity" (1940) was "sponsored by the Board of Publication of the American Lutheran Church." This pamphlet contains two lectures by Dr. Reu: (1) "Unionism," delivered at the intersynodical conferences in

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Rochelle, Ill., in 1939; (2) "What is Scripture?," delivered at the Luther Academy at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, in the summer of 1938. The doctrine of inspiration found in "Lutheran Dogmatics" (1941-42 ed.) is the same as that found in "In the Interest of Lutheran Unity." It is true, Dr. Reu has gone to his reward, yet his theology is still with us, for many of the pastors within the American Lutheran Church were his pupils. As Rev. J. H. Becker (A.L.C.) in "The Genius of Wartburg Seminary," *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Reu Memorial Number, 1945, p. 65, said, "Call it latitude if you will, but do not denounce it. In all fundamental doctrines Dr. Reu stood firmly, and every one knew where he stood. In doctrines belonging to the periphery he maintained an open mind. This attitude he imparted to his students. We believe that so long as there are students living who were tutored by Reu, this spirit will live in the American Lutheran Church. It is the spirit of the fathers who founded the (Wartburg) seminary; it is the spirit of the old Iowa Synod."

While this manuscript was in the hands of the printer we received the 1945 edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics" by Dr. M. Reu. We have compared every quotation with this latest edition and find that there is no essential difference. One or two words have been changed, and the reference to the German Text of the "Declaration," referred to above, has been omitted.

MISSOURI SEEKS CLARIFICATION

In 1941 our Synod instructed its Committee on Doctrinal Unity to prepare one document. Synod expressly stated, "c. In preparing this one document, our committee prayerfully and carefully consider all the misgivings and objections that have been expressed in memorials presented to this convention or otherwise; and that this one document be so clearly written that there can be no misunderstanding in reference to the meaning which the words are to convey; d. In calling for one document, we do not mean to dispense with any doctrinal statement made in our Brief Statement,—for we believe that it correctly expresses the doctrinal position of our Synod,—but we concede that, for the sake of clarification under the present circumstances, some statements may need to be more sharply defined or amplified" (Proceedings, 1941, p. 302). This document is now presented for our consideration in the so-called Affirmation, which states in the Preface that "the subcommittees responsible for this draft considered their task to consist chiefly in inserting into the framework of the Brief Statement the additional truths and clarifications contained in the other documents mentioned." What are these additional truths and clarifications taken from other documents? Do they actually agree with the doctrinal content of the Brief Statement? Do they actually remove the former differences? Or do they merely cover up the former differences and safeguard and perpetuate the former views of the American Lutheran Church? And what of the omissions from the Brief Statement? Are they contrary to the express instruction of Synod not "to dispense with any doctrinal statement made in our Brief Statement"? Is the new document "so clearly written that there can be no misunderstanding in reference to the meaning which the words are to convey"? These and similar questions we shall consider as

objectively, as possible. Facts and not intentions shall speak. In this connection we may add that it is not our intention to cast any aspersions on the faith of any member of our Committee on Doctrinal Unity, nor will we entertain any accusation of impure motives of any kind. However, we know that it is possible for even the most orthodox pastors and teachers to make mistakes. To err is human. If the facts prove that mistakes have been made, we shall cover such mistakes with the cloak of charity, provided such mistakes are not upheld, but corrected. Paul says, "Charity beareth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things," but precedes that statement with the words that charity "rejoiceth in the truth." Every one must give way to the truth. The truth of God's Word must rule supreme.

THE AFFIRMATION CANNOT STAND ALONE

It has been stated that we should ignore all that has gone before and consider only the words of the Affirmation and see whether or not they are in agreement with God's Word. Now it is true, it would be acting foolishly to dig up errors which have been renounced long ago. However, it would be acting just as foolishly to ignore such errors if they are being repeated to this day. We cannot ignore all that has gone before without also wilfully closing our eyes to that which at the present time is being publicly taught within the American Lutheran Church. The Brief Statement (Par. 29) says, "The orthodox character of a church is established not by its mere name nor by its outward acceptance of, and subscription to, an orthodox creed, but by the doctrine which is actually taught in its pulpits, in its theological seminaries, and in its publications." Besides the Preface to the Affirmation states that it has inserted truths and clarifications from other documents into the Brief Statement. These other documents must be examined. Furthermore, to ignore all that has gone before would be to act contrary to the express directions of Synod in 1929, "That future deliberations proceed from the exact point of controversy and take into account the pertinent history" (Proceedings, 1929, p. 113). Finally, we have the warning expressed already in 1884. Urging extreme caution in formulating union theses the editors of *Lehre & Wehre* (Vol. 30, p. 184) said, "False teachers have always followed the practice of hiding their error under individual ambiguous expressions; they simply ignore that whereby in the preceding and in the following their error is excluded as though it weren't even written there. That is a sad fact, but it is a circumstance which has to be reckoned with."

However, before we turn to our examination of the so-called Affirmation we wish to state that we write the following not because we do not desire union, but because we desire a true union with the American Lutheran Church. Without true unity of faith the truth which by the grace of God we have received from the fathers will not be handed down by us to the next generation in an unadulterated form. We are fearful that a mere glossing-over of the differences without removing them will cause true Lutheranism to be lost to the next generation. Years ago we knelt at God's altar and pledged not to compromise even a jot or tittle of God's Word and we are not willing to do so now for the sake of a mere outward union. Well has Luther said, "Cursed be that love to the deepest depths of hell which is a detriment to the doctrine of faith."

We desire to help build a Church which stands firmly united in the faith on the foundation of God's Word. To this end and this end alone we shall always labor by the grace of God.

O God, grant that some day the Lutheran Church of America may not be torn asunder by divisions and offenses and that all those who call themselves followers of Martin Luther may be true slaves of Christ rendering unquestioning obedience to His Word.

Of the Holy Scriptures

The first important addition to the Brief Statement found in the Affirmation reads, "This inspiration was not a mechanical process, as the so-called dictation theory holds, for the writers were living, thinking personalities, each endowed by the Creator with an individuality of his own and each having his peculiar style, his own manner of presentation, using at times even various sources at hand, Num. 21:14; Josh. 10:13; Luke 1:1-4. Nevertheless, by virtue of inspiration, i.e., the unique operation of the Holy Spirit, 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:21 by which He supplied to the holy writers content and fitting word, I Cor. 2:12,13, the separate books constitute an organic whole, are without contradiction and error, John 10:35, and are rightly called the Word of God." Here we would note that this addition is to a great extent taken from the Declaration; however, we must also point out that the Declaration does not contain the words, "This inspiration was not a mechanical process, as the so-called dictation theory holds," and does not have the word "are" between "organic whole" and "without contradiction and error."

At Detroit the American Lutheran Church declared "the doctrine of the Holy Scripture has been supplemented in our Declaration with reference to the human factor" (C.T.M., 1940, p. 932). Why was this addition necessary? Was there a deficiency in the doctrinal presentation of the Brief Statement? And what of the addition, "This inspiration was not a mechanical process," etc.? Against whom is this directed? Has the Missouri Synod ever taught a mechanical process of inspiration?

THE SO-CALLED DICTATION THEORY

Following in the footsteps of Luther and the Lutheran dogmaticians of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries, the Synodical Conference has insisted that the Holy Ghost is the real author of Scripture, that He wrote it through men, using the holy writers as His instruments of writing as He found them. "Scripture teaches that the holy writers were not the real authors of this Scripture, but wrote as instruments of the Holy Ghost" (Synodalbericht, Syn. Conf., 1886, p. 47). To express this idea that the holy writers were employed by the Holy Ghost as His peculiar instruments or organs of writing, the ancient Church Fathers as well as the Lutheran theologians have used various figures or illustrations. An illustration may be apt or faulty, but it is never a "theory." On the basis of Ps. 45:1, "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer," the holy writers have been called "secretaries," "hands," "pens," etc. of the Holy Ghost and divine inspiration has also been called a "dictation" by the Holy Ghost. Such expressions are correct if the point of comparison of such figures and illustrations is kept in mind. Dr. Pieper says, "As to the expressions of the Church Fathers and of the old Lutheran teachers that the holy writers were, as it were, hands, pens, secretaries, notaries of the Holy Ghost Walther says, 'The modernists may scoff at these expressions, yet they express the doctrine of Holy Scripture.' Walther explained with the majority of old teachers that the variety of style

found in the individual books of Scripture was due to the fact that the Holy Spirit used the instruments as He found them, for 'the essence of inspiration does not lie in the **new** words, but therein that words, which were otherwise in use, **passed through the mouth of God**, and were thus made His Word by God himself'" (Lehre & Wehre, 34, p. 194f). Again Pieper says, "If the expression (dictation) is pressed, it leads indeed to improper ideas. But the old Lutheran theologians, for example, have in their use of this expression not thought of an inspiration 'by an external audible utterance'" (Lehre & Wehre, 32, p. 233).

Quenstedt, who is often regarded as the chief proponent of the so-called dictation theory, says, "Not as though these divine **amanuenses** wrote ignorantly and unwillingly, beyond the reach of, and contrary to, their own will; for they wrote cheerfully, willingly, and intelligently . . . but (they are called amanuenses) because they wrote nothing of their own accord, but everything at the dictation of the Holy Ghost" (Quoted Mueller, Christian Dogmatics, p. 103f). Here we may add that it is simply not in accord with the facts when it is maintained that the Lutheran dogmaticians degraded the holy writers to lifeless machines and taught a mere mechanical process of inspiration. The Holy Spirit, says Quenstedt, used the writers as they were "fashioned and accustomed to speak and write," but that they employed "this and no other diction and this and no other word or its equivalent is due solely to the divine instigation and inspiration" (cf. quotation in Pieper, Dogmatik, I. 282). The holy writers did not choose their own words but the Holy Spirit "supplied, inspired and dictated the words themselves and all individual expressions to the holy writers" (cf. quotation in Rohnert, "Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift," p. 204). From this we learn that the very heart and soul of the so-called dictation theory of the Lutheran dogmaticians consists in this: **God as the real author of Holy Scriptures used the holy writers as His living, intelligent instruments of writing and they wrote exactly that and only that which the Holy Spirit inspired them to write.**

In Dr. Mezger's "Lessons in the Small Catechism" (1940 ed., p. 18) we read, "God inspired His prophets and apostles; that is, He taught and told them what to write, He taught and gave them the very words which they were to use. When a teacher dictates to his pupils, the children indeed write the words; yet they do not write their own words, but the words of their teacher. In a similar manner, God, as it were, dictated His Word to holy men; He told them what to write and how to write it. So the whole Bible is God's Word. Therefore it is wholly **free from error**, it is **infallible**. Everything it tells us is the truth. God will not and cannot tell us an untruth." Answering Professor Hengstenberg, who had asked how Luke could possibly write what the Holy Ghost dictated to him, since he used various oral and written sources, Dr. Stoeckhardt says, "Thus only he can ask who attributes to the orthodox teachers a childish, grossly sensual notion of the dictation of the Holy Spirit. The dictation of the Holy Ghost was not a mechanical dictation (Vorsprechen) which was then followed by a mechanical copying. The holy men of God did not sleep and dream when moved by the Holy Ghost they spoke and wrote. Their inner part, their will and mind, was set in motion. They have actually spoken and written. And that is a rational activity

of rational persons. When writing they observed the customary human manner and employed the means which authors otherwise also are accustomed to use . . . The Holy Spirit set this whole apparatus, the human searching, thinking, and arranging in motion and has taken it into His service, made it a medium of His activity, of His speaking. Not the pen, with which the prophets and apostles wrote on paper or parchment, no, the prophets and apostles themselves, were the pens, *calami*, of the Holy Ghost" (Lehre & Wehre, 32, p. 282f; cf. also the excellent article by Dr. Stoeckhardt in Lehre & Wehre, 38, 289ff, especially p. 327ff).

In 1886 the Synodical Conference (Dr. A. L. Graebner was essayist) also said, "The neo-theologians say, it is horrible when we say that the holy writers were nothing but God's instruments of writing. Thereby we make machines of them. But doesn't God understand the art, that even as He spoke through men so He can also write through men without the same becoming machines? When the apostles stood before princes and kings and spoke as God gave them utterance, they did not stand there as machines; but it was Peter, Paul, John, etc., who stood there. If they did not become machines in that case, then surely also not when they wrote. The children of God are indeed, in as much as they are spiritual, wholly led by the Spirit of God, yet thereby they do not become machines. However, we let also that stand, that the holy writers were God's machines, if a person does not lose sight of the point of comparison. Even as man, or a power added to the machine, is that which sets the machine in motion, thus God himself was that which moved the apostles to write. They did not write anything without God moving them. The apostles were God's instruments of writing, even as the Psalmist long ago called himself the pen of a ready writer; as the Holy Spirit moved them, thus they had to write" (Synodalbericht, Syn. Conf., 1886, p. 52; for a similar expression cf. Synodalbericht, Iowa Dist., 1891, p. 56). Dr. C. C. Schmidt in his "Katechismuspredigten," I, p. 5 said, "As the steam in the machine sets the same in motion, thus the Holy Spirit was in the prophets and apostles and moved them to preach and write. And then again it was not like a machine. The machine does unconsciously that to which it is driven by the steam; the holy writers knew well what they taught and wrote."

AN ILLUSTRATION NOT A THEORY

In using such expressions and illustrations our theologians were merely following the example of Scripture (Ps. 45:1) in using an illustration to bring home the truth that **God** wrote the Scriptures **through men** and that the holy writers wrote **only** that inspired by the Holy Ghost. Dr. Lenski in his "Interpretation of St. John's Revelation," p. 93, has well said, "When our dogmaticians speak about dictation, they have something else in mind. They use three **illustrations** of inspiration: (1) an amanuensis, (2) the plectrum striking the strings of the lyre, (3) the flute played by the musician. These are to illustrate the efficient cause and the instrumental cause, the inspiring Spirit and the human writers. To charge the dogmaticians with a 'dictation theory' because of one of these illustrations, is to go only one-third of the way. One must then add the lyre and flute theory as well, and then the absurdity becomes plain; for no illustration is a 'theory.' All good writers and

teachers use illustrations, and no one says them nay. An illustration may be apt or may be faulty. This applies also to these three older ones. If one does not think an illustration apt, he may offer a better one and see how it will be received." Dr. Stoeckhardt says, "It shows lack of judgment or an evil will for a person to accuse the old school of having a wholly external, mechanical conception of inspiration. The point of comparison is clear. With such comparison they only desired to emphasize very strongly that the prophets and apostles served the Holy Spirit merely as organs in order to reveal His thoughts to men, that they were in no wise His assistants, that they have received everything which they wrote, also all words and expressions, and have taken nothing from themselves" (Lehre & Wehre, 38, p. 327f).

Our Brief Statement though referring to the extent of inspiration (verbal inspiration) does not even attempt to describe the mode of inspiration and rightly so, for inspiration is and ever will remain a mystery, since no man can comprehend in what manner the holy writers were inspired of God. As the Northern Illinois District put it, "Of course we do not with our doctrine of inspiration set up a theory about the actual how, as we in general guard against calling our doctrine a theory. It is, as we would again and again convince ourselves, a fact revealed in Scripture" (Synodalbericht, 1909, p. 15). Dr. Stoeckhardt says, "That the Holy Ghost is the real author of Scripture and has spoken through the prophets and apostles we believe and confess according to Scripture. The how? however, is hidden. How inspiration was accomplished we cannot fathom. No man ever looked into this workshop of the Holy Spirit" (Lehre & Wehre, 32, p. 283). Therefore our Brief Statement—without using any illustration—simply states the same truth, which the illustrations used by our theologians were to inculcate, namely, "They (the Holy Scriptures) are the Word of God because the holy men of God who wrote the Scriptures wrote only that which the Holy Ghost communicated to them by inspiration." It is this doctrine of inspiration which the Declaration has supplemented "with reference to the human factor."

FALSE EMPHASIS ON HUMAN SIDE OF SCRIPTURE

In his "Walther as a Theologian" Dr. Pieper says, "As is well-known the newer theologians maintain that they give up the old inspiration doctrine in order to save the 'divine-human character' of Scripture, which the earlier theologians are supposed to have overlooked . . . Walther says, 'Among the various objections which modern believing theologians raise against the inspiration doctrine of our old dogmatists, one of the most common is that this doctrine with its emphasis on the divine character of Holy Scripture does not do justice to its human side, yes, wholly nullifies this side. As the Docetae in Apostolic times denied that God became a true man in Christ and taught that the supposedly human in Christ was only a semblance, so men now insist that the old Lutheran dogmatics does the same thing with the Bible; the old dogmatics also makes everything human in the Bible a mere semblance . . . What is the meaning of this noise about the old dogmatics not doing justice to the human side of Scripture? Nothing else but this: Our error is supposed to consist in this that we do not ascribe errors to Holy Scripture as we

do to every other human writing, but we would have it regarded among all the other books as the book of truth" (Lehre & Wehre, 34, 195f; cf. also Pieper, "Der Synergismus in der Lehre von der Inspiration" in Lehre & Wehre, 38, p. 193ff). Here we may add that the two ultimate truths involved in this whole question are the **inspiration** and the **infallibility of every word** of Scripture.

What is public doctrine on this question in the American Lutheran Church? In February 1939 the commissioners of the A.L.C. and the U.L.C.A. accepted the so-called "Pittsburgh Agreement" and at its convention at Detroit in 1940 the American Lutheran Church declared, "We accept the Pittsburgh Agreement with the definite conviction that the Agreement is in complete harmony with the Declaration and the Brief Statement" (C.T.M., 1940, p. 933). However, as Dr. Arndt pointed out in C.T.M., 1942, p. 943f, "It is well known that in the U.L.C.A. there has been sharp dissent from the position taken in the Pittsburgh Agreement," therefore the "Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship" of the A.L.C. proposed to the convention at Sandusky in 1944 that the Districts of the American Lutheran Church be requested to consider the statement on selective fellowship which read, "We are willing to open our pulpits to all those brethren of the U.L.C.A. who by their teaching and practice give evidence of sincere adherence to the Pittsburgh Agreement which we understand in the light of our Declaration." Notice the emphasis on the Declaration. The same emphasis is found in the statement, "We are ready to open our pulpits to all brethren of the Synodical Conference who recognize our Declaration as truly Lutheran" (Official Reports, 1944, p. 9f; Official Minutes, p. 79). The American Lutheran Church did not adopt these restrictions but asked its Districts to consider the following: "Resolved, That our pastors and congregations may have pulpit and altar fellowship with those pastors and congregations of the U.L.C.A. and the Missouri Synod whose doctrine and practice are in accord with the Pittsburgh Agreement and the Brief Statement and Declaration respectively" (Official Minutes, p. 80).

THE BIBLE—A HISTORY OF REVELATION?

The Pittsburgh Agreement says, "The Bible . . . is primarily not a code of doctrines, still less a code of morals, but the history of God's revelation for the salvation of mankind, and of man's reaction to it" (C.T.M., 1939, p. 382). In his essay, entitled "What is Scripture?" and read before the Luther Academy in Dubuque in 1938, Dr. Reu said, Scripture "is the book of the history of God's dealings with men, of His revelation and of the reaction of men towards this revelation" (In the Interest of Lutheran Unity, p. 50). "Scripture contains the history of God in His relation to mankind, the history of the revelation and self-disclosure of God in its gradual development from the first beginnings to its final consummation . . . And the history of the divine revelation recorded in Scripture is the history of a revelation for the sake of our salvation" (Ibid., p. 52). Dr. Reu summarizes, "This then is what we have in Scripture: the description of the complete self-disclosure of God and of His entrance into history, in order to prepare, to establish, to apply and to complete the salvation for mankind, and at the same time the descrip-

tion of the reaction of men over against this revelation of salvation" (Ibid., p. 54). In "Lutheran Dogmatics," 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 199 we read, "In the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament the Jewish congregation of God possessed that record of the preparatory revelation of God without which it could not have permanently existed. For the purpose of re-establishing communion with the human race, that had gone astray, God revealed himself by means of deeds; these deeds were either followed or preceded by interpretative words spoken by Moses or the prophets. Both forms of self-disclosure—through acts as well as through words—are to be viewed as divine revelation (*Offenbarung, revelatio*). But in order that the deeds once performed by the Lord and his words spoken in the past, might be preserved for posterity and might be visualized or in an absolutely trustworthy and errorless way re-presented (*Vergegenwaertigung*) for all time to come, God also provided for the literary fixation or written record of his revelation; with the result that even today men may observe God's deeds and hear his words in the same manner as did the original eye- and ear-witnesses." This has been explained that in the Bible we have a "photograph" of divine revelation.

The thought that the Bible is the history or record of divine revelation for the salvation of mankind—which, by the way, is the peculiar teaching of the so-called positive Lutheran theology of Germany—is further explained as follows: Regarding Jeremiah Dr. Reu says, "If one reads his book carefully he must recognize how sharply he draws the line between that which he received as divine word and that which he says in a merely human way . . . Who will maintain that a man like Jeremiah who when speaking, so carefully made a sharp distinction between his own reflections and God's Word, would have mixed them up when he was writing down his discourses? No, what he called God's Word, was really God's Word; he only wrote down what God told him. We begin to see that we have more in the Old Testament than a trustworthy, but merely human report; we have in the Old Testament the revelation of God, the word of God itself" (In the Interest of Lutheran Unity, p. 56f). Notice how Dr. Reu distinguishes between that which God revealed to Jeremiah and Jeremiah's own reflections. Of both we have a trustworthy record. The former is God's Word; the latter, written under the influence, guidance and assistance of the Holy Ghost, as we shall point out later, is rightly called the Word of God.

"THE WRITTEN RECORD OF REVELATION"

Regarding the literary fixation or written record of divine revelation Dr. Reu says, "Two facts appear from the way in which Jesus and the apostles employed and evaluated the Old Testament, viz., 1. that they viewed the entire Old Testament as a unity, free from all contradictions and errors, and 2. that in its composition two elements—divine and human—have co-operated" (Lutheran Dogmatics, 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 200). In 2 Tim. 3:16 the Old Testament is designated as "Spirit-created, Spirit-breathed (*Theopneustos*; in the sentence the adjective *theopneustos* is not predicate, but attributive): 'Every, or all, Spirit-created Scripture is also profitable for teaching, etc.' The O.T., then, was brought forth by the Spirit of God; God is not merely responsible for its composition, but he has also been active in its creation, he is the 'principal author'

of the O.T.; hence it may rightly be called the word spoken by the Spirit. The word *theopneustos* which is here used and which was rendered 'divinitus inspirata' in the Vulgate, has given rise to the term 'inspiration,' which denotes in dogmatical parlance, the activity of God connected with the literary fixation of his revelation. Compare to this whole chapter *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 1929: 'What is Scripture,' pp. 399ff, and Reu, 'In the Interest of Lutheran Unity,' Columbus, 1939. From the discourses of Jesus it appears that the apostles were promised the special assistance of the Holy Spirit for their entire apostolic activity; an important phase of their apostolic activity was the composition of such writings as we now possess in our New Testament canon; therefore, the assistance of the Spirit must pertain also to the production of these writings, so that in our N.T. we actually have the permanent record and errorless representation of the deeds and words of God in the new covenant, a record which came into being through the co-operation of the divine and the human elements" (Ibid., p. 203). "If it were proper to make a distinction, as to the degree of divine co-operation, between the preached word and the written word, we should, recalling the axiom, 'The written letter remains,' maintain that the divine element was active to a still stronger degree in the literary fixation of the apostolic testimony" (Ibid., p. 205). "The Old Testament is both divine and human, and even more so the New Testament. While we may be unable to describe in detail the precise manner in which the Spirit of God influenced the sacred writers, yet we may safely assert that the divine influence embraced the following three elements: 1. impulse to write, 2. suggestion of the subject matter, 3. suggestion of the word; but this divine influence did not, by any means, suspend the personal activity of the individual writers. The result of the preceding investigation—"The Scriptures owe their origin to the co-operation of the divine and human elements"—is to be accepted without any qualifications whatever. But it is practically impossible to describe in detail the mode of the divine inspiration, or the precise manner in which God influenced the biblical writers" (Ibid., p. 206f). "It is indeed true that the divine element appears more patently in some portions of the Scriptures than in others, e.g., the prophetic books with *Ecclesiastes*. But it would be incorrect to establish a theory of varying degrees of inspiration and it would ultimately lead to such inconsistencies as attributing a higher degree of inspiration to the predictive portions of *Daniel* than to Paul's Epistle to the Romans . . . The result of this mysterious interpenetration of the divine and the human elements in the production of the Scriptures, was intended to be and actually is this, that in the Scriptures the church possesses the authoritative and normative, perspicuous, sufficient, and efficacious Word of God, which it needs for the fulfillment of its mission and for the preservation of its own essence" (Ibid., p. 212f). "He who believes that the Scriptures are the Word of God, will out of holy reverence for the Word refrain from assuming that the original autographs contained an error even in these subordinate matters," i.e. matters of history, genealogy, natural science, etc. (Ibid., p. 214). In this connection we may add that the 1928 edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics" has otherwise no reference to the inerrancy of Scripture except the last quotation and expressly adds, "although it will be difficult to find a Scripture text in which this is explicitly stated."

Here then we have a doctrine which emphasizes the human factor in inspiration and which, as we shall presently show, is directed against the doctrine that God is the real author of Scripture and that the holy writers as His instruments of writing wrote exactly that and only that communicated to them by inspiration. However, before we bring this proof, we shall see what Luther taught on this point.

LUTHER AND THE SCRIPTURES

Quoting the confession of the Nicene Creed that the Holy Ghost "spake through (dia) the prophets," Luther adds, "So we refer all of Scripture to the Holy Ghost" (St. Louis ed., III, 1890). Luther called the Bible "the book of the Holy Ghost" (IX, 1775) and insisted that the sin of Judah and Tamar was not only "described" (II, 1200) but also "written by the Holy Ghost" (III, 559). "Even though it has been written through men" Holy Scripture "is nevertheless not of or from men but from God" (XIX, 621) for "not only the words but also the diction used by the Holy Ghost and the Scripture is divine" (IV, 1960). Hence the Scripture does not contradict itself (XX, 798, IX, 356) and cannot err (I, 714; III, 23; XIV, 491). Those who refer to Luther's sermon on Matt. 24 to prove that Luther did not identify inspiration with dictation but rather emphasizes human co-operation (cf. e.g. Reu, Luther and the Scriptures, p. 110f; also review by Dr. Arndt in C.T.M., 1944, p. 789 and 1945, p. 201) fail to note, as Dr. Pieper in Dogmatik I, p. 341f points out, that Luther added that "It is also the method of the Holy Ghost to speak thus in Holy Scripture" (cf. also Pieper in Lehre & Wehre, 74 (1928), p. 8f).¹

In his "Luther and the Scriptures" (1944), p. 126f, Dr. Reu quotes the Confession written by Menius and accepted by the representatives of the Duchy of Saxony at Weimar in March 1549. Dr. Reu says that as far as he knows "it was the first time that such a detailed article concerning Scripture made its appearance in a Lutheran confession." The Confession as translated by Dr. Reu reads in part, "For although both prophets and apostles, like ourselves, were natural men and descendants of Adam they, nevertheless, have not spoken nor written as men write out of their own mind; and their books and writings are certainly not their own human imaginings. It is God the Holy Ghost who spoke through their mouth and wrote through their hand. He is the real master and author of Holy Scripture, who to make known to men His Word and teaching used mouth and hand of the prophets as His organ in no other way than the prophets and apostles used their pen and ink to write the word and as David used his harp to play on it. Therefore, as the pen wrote

¹The quotation from Luther "which is concerned with proving that Luther did not identify inspiration with dictation" (Arndt) reads, "In this chapter is described the conclusion and end of both kingdoms, that of Judah and that of the whole world, but the two Evangelists, Matthew and Mark, mingle the two and do not keep the order that has been preserved in Luke, for they are concerned only about telling and repeating the words without troubling themselves as to the order in which the words were spoken . . . So understand that Matthew here weaves together and combines the end of the Jewish nation and of the world, mixed them into one dish. But if you wish to understand it, you must separate it and apply the parts to their respective ends . . . It is also the method of the Holy Ghost to speak thus in Holy Scripture" (St. Louis, VII, p. 1297).

and the harp played, not by themselves, but as the hand of the prophets and apostles conducted and governed them, just so did the prophets and apostles teach and write concerning the essence and will of the almighty and the eternal Majesty not by themselves but according to that which God the Holy Ghost gave into their hearts and mouth." To this Dr. Reu adds, "Here we for the first time have a purely mechanical conception of inspiration, and that in a Lutheran confession written by a man who was an adherent of the Gospel since 1522 . . . and always had Luther's confidence." Menius does not say that the holy writers were mere automatons, dead machines. He specifically adds that they had their "own and peculiar manner" of speaking (cf. Schmidt, "Justus Menius, der Reformator Thueringens," Vol. II, p. 95). However, he does say, according to the original German, "so haben sie doch nicht von sich selbst aus ihrem eignen natuerlichen Verstand weder geredet noch geschrieben als Menschen und sind ihre Buecher und Schriften gar nicht ihr eignes menschliches Gedicht." Notice the word "natuerlichen" Verstand. Menius does not say that the holy writers did not use their intellect, but he says that their natural intellect was not the source of that which they wrote and spoke. The holy writers were the instruments of the Holy Spirit and wrote only that which the Holy Spirit gave into their hearts. Yet this teaching which is in perfect agreement with the words of Luther and to which the Synodical Conference has always subscribed is labeled a "purely mechanical conception of inspiration."

IOWA'S VERBAL INSPIRATION

We stated that one of the ultimate truths involved in this whole question is the inspiration of **every word** of Scripture. To illustrate this truth our theologians have called the holy writers the "instruments of the Holy Ghost" and have compared inspiration with "dictation." Does Dr. Reu teach that the holy writers did not of themselves choose their own words but that God gave and imparted to them those words and expressions of which Scripture consists? He writes, "On basis of the terms **theopneustos** and **inspirata**, II Tim. 3:16, the biblical authors have been described as flutes blown by the Holy Spirit; or they have been described as the penmen and pens, who merely recorded on paper whatever the Spirit dictated to them; but this would result in a merely mechanical dictate, would degrade the holy writers to lifeless tools, would be in contradiction to the way in which the Holy Ghost works upon the human mind, would do away with the co-operation of the holy writers mentioned above on the basis of Scripture and is not demanded by the prepositions **dia** and **en** used f.i. in Matt. 1:22; 2:15; Heb. 4:7 nor by the term **theopneustos** in II Tim. 3:16" (Lutheran Dogmatics 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 207). We would here refer our reader to Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. I, p. 275ff.

What does Dr. Reu actually teach concerning "the supply or communication of the fitting word"? He writes, "It is true, there is a theory of verbal inspiration that must be refuted. It is that theory of inspiration that degrades the authors of the Biblical books to dead writing machines who without any inner participation wrote down word for word what was dictated to them by the Spirit." From this we see **THAT**

THERE ARE TWO DIFFERENT DOCTRINES OF "VERBAL" INSPIRATION.² Dr. Reu clearly states that there is a certain doctrine of verbal inspiration which he calls a "theory" and which he rejects. Against whom is this directed? Who teaches a verbal inspiration? The Synodical Conference. However, the Synodical Conference has never taught that the holy writers wrote "without any inner participation." As Dr. Stoeckhardt said, "The Holy Spirit set this whole apparatus, the human searching, thinking, and arranging in motion and has taken it into His service, made it a medium of His activity, of His speaking" (Lehre & Wehre, 32, p. 283, cf. full quotation p. 14, above). But the Synodical Conference has always taught and still teaches that the holy writers "wrote down word for word" what was communicated to them by inspiration. As the Brief Statement puts it, "the holy men of God . . . wrote only that which the Holy Ghost communicated to them by inspiration." From this we see that the charge of degrading the writers to dead writing machines is more or less a feint in order to cover up the attack on the inspiration of every word of Scripture. Referring to I Cor. 2:12,13 Dr. Reu continues, "Here concerning the word spoken by the apostle and his co-workers we find expressed both the operation of the Spirit and the co-operation of the apostle. Bachmann³ recognized that and expressed it better than many another expositor. Even the formation of the word was taught by the Spirit. Not as if man had been inactive. Even here and not only as far as the contents are concerned, the writers worked as living personalities. Paul at times apparently is wrestling with the language; the richness of thoughts flowing in upon him is now and then so overwhelming that he drops the construction, from the Septuagint which he as a rule is following he goes back to the Hebrew original, once or twice he corrects himself as in the well known passage about the numbers of those he had baptized in Corinth (I. Cor. 1:14-16); and above all, each author uses his own style, has his own vocabulary and his own circle of concepts. And yet the finished product is after all not his word but God's word, even the selection of the fitting word was taught him by the Spirit" (In the Interest of Lutheran Unity, p. 68f). According to these words the holy writers as self-active personalities wrote the words which they themselves had chosen "under the guidance of the Spirit," or "under divine influence," or with the "special assistance of the Spirit,"—as Dr. Reu as a rule refers to "inspiration"—and as a result of the "mysterious interpenetration of the divine and the human elements in the production of the Scriptures" the finished product is God's Word. **Dr. Reu does teach a verbal inspiration in the sense that the writers wrote their words under the influence of the Holy Spirit, but he does not teach that the Holy Spirit caused the writers to use exactly**

²Brunn already referred to this distinction when he said in his "Katechismuserklärung" (1889) p. 14, "It is said, that there is indeed a verbal inspiration (Wortinspiration) of Holy Scripture, but no inspiration of words (Woerterinspiration), that is to say, here and there may indeed be individual passages of Holy Scripture literally inspired or given by God, with their words, but by no means is that the case concerning all words of Holy Scripture from its first page to its last page."

³Regarding Bachmann we would refer our reader to Pieper's "Ist die Heilige Schrift direktes oder nur 'abgeleitetes Wort Gottes'?" in Lehre & Wehre, 72 (1926), p. 193ff; also 74 (1928), p. 9ff.

THAT word found in Scripture and none other. This is even more evident from the fact that Dr. Reu interprets the "all Scripture" in II Tim. 3:16 as referring to the "whole" and not "to every passage of Scripture." He writes, "Only two translations deserve serious consideration: either 'all Scripture' which the A.V. offers, or 'every Scripture' in the sense of 'every Scripture passage,' which the R.V. prefers. Since we may rightly assume that what Timothy had learned from a child consisted in individual Scripture passages, we might be inclined to accept the rendering of the R.V. as the correct one. However, the following words would hardly fit, because not every Scripture passage, although written under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, etc. (f. i. the passage Gen. 12:6, 'and the Canaanite was then in the land'). So Luther's *alle Schrift* and the rendering of the A.V. 'all Scripture' is to be preferred. 'All Scripture' then has its analogue in 'all the building' in Ephesians 2:21, or 'scripture' as designation of a known quantity is treated as a proper noun, as 'all Jerusalem.' . . . The statement is made about the written word of the Old Testament in its whole extent that it has been produced by the breathing of the Spirit of God. Whether some one else participated in its production is not stated, it is neither maintained nor denied. Emphasized, however, is the fact that God was the 'first cause' in producing it; He is the 'principal author' of the whole of the Old Testament Scripture; it is He himself who here speaks with us" (Ibid., p. 62). Here we would note that if the "God-breathed" in 2 Tim. 3:16 is to be applied to Scripture only as a "whole" and not to "every Scripture passage" then it is self-evident that it cannot be applied to every word of Scripture.

INFALLIBILITY OF EVERY WORD LOST

The denial of the Scriptural doctrine of the inspiration of every word of Scripture brings with it a denial of the infallibility of every word of Scripture. Dr. Reu writes on this point as follows: "By this unique operation of the Spirit upon the holy writers a Scripture came into existence which in all its parts is God's infallible word for mankind for the purpose of its salvation . . . A certain holy awe kept me always from the assumption of errors in the original copies of the Scripture and its parts; even the mere possibility of errors seemed to me excluded by this reverential fear . . . If in 2 Tim. 3:16 it is said of 'all the Scripture' that it is God-breathed, brought forth by the Spirit of God,"—according to Dr. Reu this does not refer to "every Scripture passage"—"does this not exclude every error from the original copy to which the term 'God-breathed' alone can refer? If in John 10:35 the general rule 'The Scripture cannot be broken' is applied to a single, one might say, incidentally written word—if in Scripture we may term anything at all as casual and incidental—which was, indeed, important for the understanding and time of theocracy, but has nothing to do with our salvation, have we then a right to assume errancy for any part of Scripture? . . . It is true, there are many observations concerning the original as well as the present text of Scripture which make it difficult to hold fast to the absolute inerrancy of Scripture . . . Faith does not close its eyes to what has been called the 'Knechts-gestalt' (form of a servant) of Scripture; it recognizes what is human in Scripture not less than its critics; but at the same time faith keeps an

open eye for its glory and, therefore, holds fast to Scripture as the Word of God" (Ibid., p. 70ff). Note the clear-cut statement that Scripture is in all its parts the infallible Word of God. But there is no statement that **every word** of Scripture is infallible. Referring to the words of Jesus, "The Scripture cannot be broken," Dr. Reu writes, "This can mean nothing else but this: The Old Testament Scripture cannot in such a way be dissolved into fragments, that by doing so its unified structure is destroyed and its individual parts lose their validity . . . The Old Testament Scripture is a wonderful unity without contradiction. Jesus apparently was of the conviction: with the formation of the Old Testament God—we say God, not the individual writers, who did not even know that their writings were to become part of a whole, authoritative for all the future—aimed at the establishment of a coherent unity of holy writings containing no contradictions and, therefore, took the greatest care that the statements of the individual book as well as the statements of all books came into a relation of complete harmony to each other . . . Consequently, even more casual and unimportant statements of the Old Testament dare not be considered negligible nor should they be deprived of their validity by a one-sided emphasis upon others. They belong to that coherent, unified whole in which there are no contradictions" (Ibid., p. 58). The New Testament with the Old Testament "form one organic whole" (Ibid., p. 76).

THE AFFIRMATION ON INSPIRATION

Turning our attention to the Affirmation we would first call our reader's attention to the words, "This inspiration was not a mechanical process, as the so-called dictation theory holds." Again and again the Synodical Conference has been falsely accused of teaching a mechanical dictation theory because we have used certain illustrations—which may be apt or faulty; it is up to the critic to suggest a better one—to inculcate the truth that God wrote the Bible through men, that He used certain individuals as His living, conscious, thinking instruments of writing, and that the holy writers wrote only that which the Holy Ghost communicated to them by inspiration. Recall Dr. Reu's criticism of the "Confession" of Menius and then judge for yourself!

In the second place we would point to the words, "for the writers were living, thinking personalities . . . rightly called the Word of God." Here we have the same **false emphasis on the human factor** in inspiration which was always rejected and condemned by Dr. Walther, Dr. Pieper and the other theologians of our Synod (cf. *Lehre & Wehre*, 34, p. 195f), and especially "Der Synergismus in der Lehre von der Inspiration" in *Lehre & Wehre*, 38, p. 193ff). Dr. Pieper calls the "inspiration-synergism" an "antiscritptural heresy" (Ibid., p. 197). Why? **Because it makes possible a denial of the Scriptural doctrine that every word of Scripture is inspired of God and therefore actually is God's Word. It makes room for the false teaching that Scripture is rightly called the Word of God because it was written under divine influence, direction and assistance.** Dr. Pieper has well said that if we substitute divine assistance, direction and guidance for the impartation of those words of which Holy Scripture consists, then Scripture would in all events "be the inerrant word of men, but not the living, majestic Word of God, glowing with

divine energy" (Dogmatik, I, p. 265). As Walther put it, "We need not only the truth, but **divine** truth. We must have a word which has passed through the mouth of God and in consequence thereof glows with divine energy and sharpness, so to say, immersed in God's mind. The simple truth works through persuasion, not so God's Word" (Quoted by Pieper, Lehre & Wehre, 34, 194).

In the third place we would point out that the Affirmation has contrary to the express direction of our Synod, not "to dispense with any doctrinal statement made in our Brief Statement," **stricken the Brief Statement's direct testimony to the Scriptural doctrine of the infallibility of ALL THE WORDS of Holy Scripture and has in the words, "The separate books constitute an organic whole, are without contradiction and error," made room for an unscriptural view of the infallibility of Scripture which does not teach that every word is infallible.** The sentence stricken from Par. 1 reads, "Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters." It is true, some words from the last part have been inserted into Par. 4 where the "parts" of Scripture are referred to, yet the express statement that **all the words of Scripture are infallible** is nowhere found in the Affirmation, and we may add, it is found neither in the Declaration nor in Dr. Reu's "Lutheran Dogmatics" and in "In the Interest of Lutheran Unity." We believe that Dr. Pieper purposely inserted "and words" into the Brief Statement, for, after treating of the "parts" of Scripture in his "Christliche Dogmatik," I, 265, he shows that Scripture is "in **all its words and in everyone of its words wholly errorless**" (p. 266ff). The Affirmation on the other hand merely states the "separate books" (considered as a "whole") "are without contradiction and error" (Par. 1) and rejects as a horrible and blasphemous doctrine "that Holy Scripture is not in all its **parts** the Word of God" (Par. 4). All this agrees perfectly with Dr. Reu's teaching but does not do full justice to that which Missouri has always taught.

However, it has been contended that if Scripture as a whole and in all its parts is infallible, then every word must also be infallible. That is true according to the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration, for if the Holy Spirit imparted to the writers the very words which they used and if the holy writers wrote only that communicated to them by inspiration, then it follows that every one of their words must be infallible, for the Holy Spirit cannot err. Such inspiration absolutely excludes all error and even its possibility. "To err does not befit God." On the other hand, if the writers wrote merely under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit, then the possibility of error is not absolutely excluded. Dr. Reu maintained that it was "difficult to hold fast to the absolute inerrancy of Scripture" and said that holy awe kept him from the assumption of errors and even the mere possibility of errors seemed to him excluded by this reverential fear. Par. 4 says that it is a horrible and blasphemous doctrine that Scripture is in part the Word of God and in part the word of man. **All its parts are God's Word.** Explaining this in the light of Par. 1 we have the following: The whole Bible is rightly called the Word of God, because by virtue of inspiration, i.e., the unique operation of the

Holy Spirit by which He supplied content and fitting word, the separate books constitute an organic whole, are without contradiction and error. "This verbal inspiration"—not that every word is inspired, but that the Holy Spirit supplied content and fitting word—"is not a so-called 'theological deduction,' but is taught by direct statements of the Scriptures." Thus the Brief Statement's verbal inspiration is cast aside and room is made for the Declaration's peculiar view of inspiration. It must also be remembered that the Brief Statement referred to the **parts** and to the **words** of Scripture. The Affirmation on the other hand refers to the **organic whole** and to the **parts** and has **no reference to the words** of Scripture. The Holy Spirit supplied the fitting word, not words. Against what is all this hue and cry about a mechanical dictation theory directed? It is directed against the truth that Scripture is "in all its words and in everyone of its words wholly errorless."

And that truth, expressly confessed in the Brief Statement, has been stricken from the Affirmation.

IOWA'S PECULIAR "RULE OF FAITH"

There is, however, another fact that we would point out before we close this chapter on the Holy Scriptures. In the last part of Par. 2 we read, "With the Confessions of our Church we teach also that the 'rule of faith' (*analogia fidei*) according to which the Holy Scriptures are to be understood are the clear passages of the Scriptures themselves which set forth the individual doctrines (Apology, Triglot, p. 441, No. 60; Mueller, p. 284). The rule of faith is not the man-made, so-called 'totality of Scripture' ('*Ganzes der Schrift*')." In spite of the fact that the American Lutheran Church in 1938 accepted the doctrinal content of the Brief Statement we find that this false teaching regarding the "rule of faith" is still taught in the latest edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics" (1941-42 ed.). In connection with the doctrine of the universal will Dr. Reu says, "The result of the exegesis of obscure texts is to be tested by comparison with the sum total of clearly revealed Scriptural truth, the so-called *analogia fidei* or *analogia scripturae*" (Vol. I, p. 66; 1928 ed., p. 44: "We may determine whether or not the results of our exegetical labors upon obscure passages are correct, from the relation in which these results stand toward the totality of clearly revealed scriptural truths"). Again in treating of the doctrine of Scripture he says, "The sum total of the perspicuous passages is, as it were, the guardian of truth so that a disagreement between individual exegetical results and this sum-total is an indication that the divinely intended sense of the respective passage has not yet been discovered" (1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 217; 1928 ed., p. 298; In the Interest of Lutheran Unity, p. 75). We believe that there are only two reasonable explanations of this fact: **Either this false doctrine is safeguarded by the term "organic whole" or the second part of Par. 2 is not regarded by the American Lutheran Church as being included in the "Doctrinal Content of the Brief Statement."**

In 1904 at the intersynodical conference at Detroit the representatives of Iowa and Ohio referred to the "rule of faith," the highest norm of Biblical interpretation, as the "harmonious whole or system," the "totality of Scripture," the "sum of all doctrinal articles," and the "organic whole" (cf. Lehre & Wehre, 50, p. 406; 52, p. 207). Comparing this

with the quotations from Dr. Reu cited above we find that the same ideas lurk in the background of his use of the term "organic whole." What do the words, "the separate books constitute an organic whole, are without contradiction and error" mean? If it means that the Bible is a unit—that is correct. Furthermore, if it is maintained that the Bible as a whole is without contradiction and error—that is also correct. As Dr. Pieper said, "If I have proved that I have a certain and definite word of Scripture for the doctrine which I teach, then I have thereby proved, that it is not in contradiction but in perfect harmony with every other doctrine of Scripture; how? that is not my business, but God's. If we cannot harmonize this or that, 'which we have not been commanded to do' (Triglot., p. 1081), our God can do it" (Synodalbericht Allgemein., 1884, p. 177). However, if this sentence implies that the sum-total of clear passages is the guardian of truth and that it is the business of the theologian to harmonize, for example, the doctrine of universal grace and the doctrine of election, as the American Lutheran Church insists on doing to this day, then this statement is to be rejected. At least this must be admitted by every unprejudiced reader, that this whole sentence does not conform to the instructions of our Synod, "that this one document be so clearly written that there can be no misunderstanding in reference to the meaning which the words are to convey."

We mentioned as another reasonable explanation that the second part of Par. 2 may not be regarded by the American Lutheran Church as being included in the doctrinal content of the Brief Statement. In 1938 at Sandusky the American Lutheran Church declared that "the Brief Statement viewed in the light of our Declaration is not in contradiction to the Minneapolis Theses." Asked by our committee to explain the meaning of these words, the American Lutheran Church officially declared in 1940 at Detroit that among other things they meant "that we are conscious of our agreement with 'the points of doctrine' contained therein (the Brief Statement), without, however, on our part sharing the exegetical or other lines of argumentation in every case and without feeling obligated in every case to employ the same terminology" (C.T.M., 1940, p. 932). The commissioners of the American Lutheran Church had mentioned certain matters which they did not regard as "points of doctrine" (cf. Proceedings, 1941, p. 277f). If we compare the points there mentioned with the Affirmation we will find that the words or the Scripture passages of the Brief Statement which were involved have been either removed or retained by the Affirmation. Therefore we are at a loss to know whether a certain expression of the Brief Statement is to be regarded as a matter of terminology or as being part of the exegetical or other lines of argumentation or whether it is to be regarded as actually belonging to the doctrinal content of the Brief Statement. In view of this we would ask two pertinent questions: Is the Preface or Foreword, or whatever it may be called, to be regarded as an integral part of the Doctrinal Affirmation? Does the American Lutheran Church still subscribe only to the doctrinal content of that part of the Brief Statement included in the Affirmation?

Of Conversion

The Affirmation adds to the Brief Statement at the end of Par. 14, "We therefore reject also the Calvinistic teaching that grace works irresistibly."

The expression "irresistible grace" is not employed either by the Formula of Concord or by the Brief Statement, nevertheless both describe conversion in such terms that the Calvinistic error is absolutely excluded. The Brief Statement rejects the Calvinistic irresistible grace in the words, "Many hearers of the Word indeed remain unconverted and are not saved, not because God does not earnestly desire their conversion and salvation, but solely because they stubbornly resist the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost" and "any man's non-conversion is due to himself alone: it is the result of his obstinate resistance against the converting operation of the Holy Ghost." No Calvinist can subscribe to these statements. However, it is to be remembered that even though the expression that grace does not work "irresistibly" is correct in itself, yet **Dr. Pieper purposely avoided this expression in the Brief Statement because since the days of the Reformation this term has been misused by the synergists to safeguard the false doctrine of man's self-determination and dissimilar conduct** (For Pieper's reasons why "the expression 'irresistible grace' is to be rejected" cf. *Lehre & Wehre*, 33, p. 117ff; 160ff).

Already in 1578, at the Colloquy at Herzberg, Chemnitz and the other authors of the Formula of Concord had to oppose the rationalistic deduction made by the synergists of that day: Whoever maintains that the unregenerated person resists until he is converted thereby teaches a conversion by force (cf. *Lehre & Wehre*, 28, p. 360f). In 1646 the Strassburg Theological Faculty declared that a person does not necessarily teach an "irresistibly determined" grace if he refuses to say with Latermann that man has the ability to use or not use the powers conferred by divine grace or to will or not will his own conversion (cf. *Lehre & Wehre*, 18, p. 264). In 1881 Professor Loy of Columbus declared, "The Calvinistic 'irresistible grace' is the natural and necessary result of the St. Louis doctrine of Election and is directly implied in Prof. Pieper's theory of conversion" (*Lehre & Wehre*, 27, p. 340; Read the whole article, p. 333ff; also statement from "Altes und Neues" in *Lehre & Wehre*, 28, p. 267ff; 271; 455f). Dr. Pieper called this "a patched-on conclusion" (*Synodalbericht, Allgemein*, 1884, p. 172).

MISSOURI NEVER TAUGHT "IRRESISTIBLE GRACE"

Again and again Missouri has been falsely accused of being Calvinistic and of teaching an irresistible grace. Why? Because Missouri has always taught that every unconverted man not only naturally but also wilfully resists the operation of the Holy Ghost. He can never of himself, either by his natural powers or by the powers conferred by divine grace, cease to resist wilfully, and will continue such resistance until he is converted. Yet God has a way of overcoming and causing

such wilful resistance to cease. He changes man's perverse will and does it without using an irresistible force, simply by exerting His gracious influence on man's will and changing unwillingness to willingness. The Formula of Concord says, "Although God does not force man to become godly (for those who always resist the Holy Ghost and persistently oppose the known truth, as Stephen says of the hardened Jews, Acts 7:51, are not converted), yet God the Lord draws the man whom He wishes (decreed) to convert, and draws him in such a way that his darkened understanding is turned into an enlightened one and his perverse will into an obedient one. And that is what the Scriptures call creating a new heart, Ps. 51:10" (Triglot., p. 905). God simply "changes stubborn and unwilling into willing men through the drawing of the Holy Ghost" (Triglot., p. 915). In opposition to this Iowa and Ohio formerly taught that unconverted man ceases to resist wilfully either by natural powers or by the powers offered to him by divine grace. Today it is taught that all men are by nature inclined to natural resistance; but he who adds to this natural resistance a wilful resistance cannot be converted, for though the Holy Spirit can and does overcome man's natural resistance He cannot overcome man's wilful resistance. Whoever teaches that the Holy Spirit overcomes man's wilful resistance teaches an irresistible grace.

This was the real issue of the Predestinarian Controversy sixty years ago and this is the real issue today. Once the American Lutheran Church concedes that divine grace has a way of overcoming or hindering wilful resistance without using coercion and once it concedes that every unconverted man who has volition, also those who are converted by the grace of God, wilfully resists divine grace until he is converted, then the long controversy which has these many years divided Missouri from Ohio and Iowa has been happily settled. Then there is no material difference between us in the doctrine of conversion.

In the *St. Sebald Theses* of 1880 Iowa declared: "It is a subversive false doctrine which utterly destroys the ethical character of conversion and is bound to poison the whole conception of the Christian doctrine when it is taught that God converts those whom He has once elected to eternal life, even if they resist ever so wilfully. This doctrine of irresistible grace includes in the bud the whole doctrine of absolute predestination, whether one draws all consequences of this statement or leaves some of them unmentioned . . . Hence the eternal lot of man does not depend on an absolute decree of an election grace operating irresistibly without taking into any account the dissimilar conduct of man, but the dissimilar conduct of men must here certainly be taken into consideration" (Quellen und Dokumente, p. 350f).

Here someone will interrupt and say that all this was settled in the Chicago Theses. In 1929 the "Examining Committee for Intersynodical Theses" reported to Synod, "We furthermore criticize that neither in the 'Short Presentation' etc., nor under 'A' was the distinction between 'natural' and 'wilful' resistance ruled out, so now as before our opponents can still say: Converted is only he who resists 'naturally'; he who resists 'wilfully' makes it impossible for the Holy Spirit to convert him" (Report and Memorials, 1929, p. 132). Again it will be objected: That false doctrine is emphatically rejected and condemned in Par. 12 of the Brief

Statement. That is true. However, it must be remembered that at Sandusky the American Lutheran Church declared that it viewed the Brief Statement "in the light of" the Declaration, and at Detroit it said that in the Declaration "in the doctrines of Election and Conversion those points have been emphasized which seemed essential" to it. The word "also" clearly shows that something additional is rejected by the Affirmation and not merely the truth expressed by the Brief Statement in the words, that those who remain unconverted do so "solely because they stubbornly resist the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost." The American Lutheran Church agrees with us that those who are lost wilfully and obstinately resist the divine grace, but it denies that those who are converted do wilfully resist before their conversion. Hence it is evident that by inserting the words, "We therefore reject also the Calvinistic teaching that grace works irresistibly," the Affirmation has opened the door to a false doctrine. By a misapplication of the rejection of "irresistible grace" to the Scriptural position of the Synodical Conference, the false doctrine, which holds that the reason why one is converted and not another is due to a difference in unconverted man: one resisting merely "naturally," the other resisting "wilfully," is safeguarded.

This false doctrine regarding unconverted man has been consistently taught within the American Lutheran Church to this day.

IOWA'S FALSE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION

What did Dr. Reu, the chief author of the Declaration, understand under the term "irresistible grace"? In his "Lutheran Dogmatics" he says, "There is no 'irresistible grace' (Matt. 23:37). Precisely for this reason, the new life in man has been produced, in spite of man's absolute passivity and God's sole causality, in such a way that man's personality was not subjected to coercion and that the possibility of contrary choice was never excluded. If . . . man refuses to heed the voice of the Gospel that would create faith, the momentary condition of 'mere passivity' ceases of course . . . His natural resistance has now assumed the form of voluntary opposition (*mutwilliges Widerstreben*); the hour of grace has been idled away, and his guilt has been heavily increased" (1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 136; 1928 ed., p. 265). "God does not coerce man with irresistible force ('irresistible grace') . . . but influences him in a manner comporting with his personality" (1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 132; 1928 ed., p. 263). According to Dr. Reu natural man has after the Fall "retained personality . . . Man may determine from instance to instance in what relation to the immanent Spirit of God his own spirit is or should be" (1941-42 ed., I, p. 139f; 1928 ed., p. 104f). All this is explained in the following words, "When this divine invitation is extended to an adult being, a natural man, who is filled with enmity against everything spiritual and divine, he may react in one of two ways: He can permit his natural resistance to God . . . to assume such proportions that from the very outset he evades the Word of God, and even despises and blasphemes it. In this way he obstructs the approach of the Holy Spirit to his heart, making it impossible for the Spirit to begin His saving ministry through the Word . . . The other possible mode of man's reaction is this: He can, in response to the warning voice of his own conscience . . . suppress such violent outbursts of his natural opposition and decide to hear the

Word of God . . . He is nevertheless as yet a natural man, filled with enmity against God" (1941-42 ed. II, p. 133f; 1928 ed. p. 263f). Here we may add that "Lutheran Dogmatics" is thoroughly saturated with this idea. We meet it in the beginning. "The real nature of the Christian religion is maintained far more genuinely in the faith and confession of the Lutheran Church: through the means of grace, instituted by himself, God efficaciously approaches the individual with the fullness of salvation wrought by Jesus Christ; in every one who does not wilfully resist, he creates faith as the hand that accepts God and salvation" (1941-42 ed., I, p. 7; 1928 ed., p. 4). We meet it again at the end. "According to Rom. 2:6 also the heathen will be judged on the basis of their works, cf. also Rev. 20:11-14. Now since it is established that there is no salvation for sinful man except in Christ, the question arises how we may combine these two declarations. Possibly in this manner: also in the world of heathenism, the life of each individual represents a sum total which reveals either that he utterly hardened himself against the voice of conscience or that he heeded it. This actual condition will be revealed in the judgment. And if now, at the visible appearance of Christ, they behold him whom they did not see on earth, then this meeting will have the practical significance of vocation and a last offer of salvation. Those who did not harden their hearts against the voice of their conscience will be attracted by the rays of salvation; the others will even now wilfully close their eyes and their hearts" (1941-42 ed., II, p. 253f; 1928 ed., p. 323). Aside from the fact that Dr. Reu here has the same false emphasis on wilful resistance, he here by his speculation concerning the heathen clearly denies Heb. 9:27: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Scripture knows of no "vocation and a last offer of salvation" for anyone after death. In this connection we may add that the same doctrine concerning wilful resistance is found in the "Lutheran Standard," 1944, July 22nd, p. 9. There we read, "Through the law the Spirit of God brings man to a knowledge of his sin and, if not wilfully resisted, He will also produce sorrow because of sin."

Of the Means of Grace

THE WORD OF THE GOSPEL

In 1938 the American Lutheran Church is supposed to have accepted what it regards as the "doctrinal content" of the Brief Statement without on its part "sharing the exegetical or other lines of argumentation in every case and without feeling obligated in every case to employ the same terminology." Our committee reported to our Synod in 1941 that, "Points in the Brief Statement listed as belonging to this class were the following: . . . b) That the Word of the Gospel and the Sacraments are the means of grace, Par. 21 (the preferred terminology being that the Word and the Sacraments are the means of grace)" (Proceedings, 1941, p. 278). We mentioned before that debated words and Scripture passages in the Brief Statement were either removed or retained in the Affirmation. In this case the expression of the Brief Statement was retained.

Why does the American Lutheran Church object to the statement, "These means of grace are the Word of the Gospel"? We answer: Because it desires to safeguard the error, which has been consistently taught within the American Lutheran Church, that the Law as a means of grace puts the sinner in the condition of "mere passivity," so that the Gospel can then bring him to faith (This error is treated extensively by Dr. Pieper in "Die Gnadenmittellehre der Synergisten," Dogmatik, III, p. 144ff).

Reviewing Dr. Reu's "Christian Ethics" in C.T.M., 1936, p. 637f, Dr. Arndt writes: "There (page 131) we are told that, when God, in converting the sinner, works upon him with the Law, the sinner becomes 'conscious of God's terrible wrath over sin and this consciousness strikes him down (terrors of a stricken conscience), crushes his heart, and temporarily brings to a halt his natural resistance, i.e., it makes him 'entirely passive' (Form. Conc. Art. II, p. 54). But the Word of God is also Gospel; it is the message of divine grace, of forgiveness of sins through Christ, full of life-giving power. In the very moment—because Scripture knows of no state of religious neutrality—when man through the Law has been made entirely passive, the Gospel points him to Christ and His inviting Savior-love, and the Spirit, working through that Gospel in a mysterious, creative way, brings about a new understanding and new powers of the will, new inner motions. He provides, again through the creative power of the Word, the organ which is able to receive the Word, even Christ Himself as a personal Savior. This organ is faith' etc. We are at a loss how to understand this function here ascribed to the Law." To this we may add that all this should not be strange to one who does not close

his eyes to the synergism taught in the same book (cf. Review of "Christian Ethics" by Prof. Meyer in *Quartalschrift*, 1936, p. 157f).⁴

The same doctrine is taught by Pastor Emch in the "Lutheran Standard," 1944, July 22nd, p. 8f. "Conversion consists of two parts or steps. The Spirit of God through the law gets a man to see his sin in all its blackness . . . He becomes alarmed, he sees he needs help; he loathes sin, he mourns over it . . . Through the law the Spirit of God brings man to a knowledge of his sin and, if not wilfully resisted, He will also produce sorrow because of sin. In other words, the law of God is the means by which the sinner must be brought to penitence. Sorrow and only sorrow would lead to despair, therefore by the Gospel, which is the good news of God's grace as offered to the penitent because of the atoning blood of Christ, the divine Spirit brings man to faith in Jesus as his heaven-sent Savior . . . Therefore it is the Word of God as the organ and the agency of the divine Spirit that converts the sinner and keeps him in a state of conversion."

In view of all this is it not difficult to escape the conclusion **that the Scriptural Doctrine of the Brief Statement, that the "Word of the Gospel" and the Sacraments are the means of grace, is now being accepted by the American Lutheran Church in the Affirmation merely as a matter of terminology, not of Doctrine?**

THE OBJECT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

In the same paragraph the Affirmation has stricken "none other than" from the Brief Statement's, "Likewise the object of the Lord's Supper that is, of the ministration of the body and blood of Christ, is none other than the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins." In 1941 our committee reported to our Synod that among the points of the Brief Statement which the American Lutheran Church would not accept was: "(c) That the effect of the Lord's Supper is none other than the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins, Par. 21 (the contention being that benefits belonging to the realms of sanctification should not be excluded; besides, some members of the American Lutheran Church commission held that a possible physical effect of the Lord's Supper should not be denied)." It was furthermore reported, "On the points pertaining to . . . the inclusion of sanctification among the benefits of the Lord's Supper agreement was reached" (Proceedings, 1941, p. 278). Here we may add that in this case the words

⁴It seems strange that any one in our circles does not immediately recognize the synergism hidden behind this use of the expression "mere passivity." While Luther and the Lutheran Confessions understand under this term that man is an object to be converted and does not do anything but only suffers an operation of the Holy Ghost—faith is created in man without his being active in producing it—the Iowans and Ohioans have always subverted this truth by giving the expressing the meaning of a certain condition in which man must be found if he is to be converted. Dr. Reu said, as quoted in a previous chapter, "If . . . man refuses to heed the voice of the Gospel that would create faith, the momentary condition of 'mere passivity' ceases of course." That means, that man must be entirely passive; he must keep still and not add to his natural resistance a wilful resistance, otherwise the Holy Spirit can not convert him through the Gospel. Thus man's "mere passivity" becomes an active performance, a positive co-operation with the Holy Ghost. That is synergism.

of the Brief Statement which were involved were removed from the Affirmation.

We maintain that thereby the Affirmation has removed the Brief Statement's purposely inserted bar against the false doctrine of the Romanists, the Reformed, and the Synergists. It has thereby opened the door to the anti-Scriptural view which holds not only "that benefits belonging to the realms of sanctification should not be excluded" but "that a possible physical effect of the Lord's Supper should not be denied."

Distinguishing between object (Zweck, the word used in the German Brief Statement) and effect (Wirkung) Dr. Pieper writes, "All the means of grace have the same object and the same effect, namely, the offering of the forgiveness of sins and the thereby effected engendering and strengthening of the faith" (Dogmatik, III, p. 127). Again he says that the Lord's Supper is "no more and no less than a means ordained by Christ through which Christ offers and conveys the forgiveness of sins acquired by Him to the partakers of this Supper" (Ibid., III, p. 343). Finally he writes, "in respect to the object (Zweck) of the Lord's Supper it is important to hold fast over against the Romanists, the Calvinistic and Arminian Reformed, also against all Synergists . . . that the proper (eigentliche) and immediate (naechste) object of the Holy Supper is the offering, assuring, and sealing of the **free and full pardon of sins** . . . All the other effects (Wirkungen) of the Lord's Supper are not **coordinate** with, but **subordinate** to, the offering of the forgiveness of sins. As effects of the Lord's Supper are rightly mentioned: strengthening of the faith, union with Christ, union with the spiritual body of Christ, the Church, furtherance in sanctification, enkindling of love to God and to the neighbor, increase in patience and the hope of eternal life. However, all these effects depend not only in part but **wholly** on the fact that the Lord's Supper is a means of the forgiveness of sins" (Ibid., III, p. 442).

It is interesting to trace the connection between the denial of the real purpose of the Lord's Supper and the idea of a physical effect of the Lord's Supper. Kahnis says, "A person must openly confess that the Lutheran designation of the purpose (Zweck) of the Lord's Supper is not established. If the truth is wholly on his (Luther's) side in defending the reception of the true body and blood of Christ, he withdraws the force from this fundamental fact, when he does not see in it the purpose of the Lord's Supper, but only a guarantee of the appropriation of the word of the forgiveness of sin . . . What other purpose can the Lord's Supper have except union with Christ's body and life" ("Die Lehre vom Abendmahl," Leipzig, 1851, p. 327, 470). Delitzsch says, "Whosoever is baptized and partakes of the Lord's Supper is a member of the body of Christ. The body of Christ is the sum-total of all those who have been baptized into one body and drink into one spirit. Be it Hengstenberg or Wislizenus" (a denier of the Trinity), "due to the act of God, which faith does not effect and unbelief does not frustrate, both are members of one and the same body" (Quoted Baier, Compendium (Walther ed.) III, p 509). Here we have the Catholic doctrine of **ex opere operato** (by the deed performed), i.e., that God imparts grace without faith, and at the same time also the false doctrine of the Church, which we shall consider in the next chapter, namely, that the mere use of the means of

grace makes a person a member of the body of Christ, the "one holy Christian Church." At the Lutheran World Convention in Paris in 1935 Dr. Reu said, "This Church" (which "makes use of the means of grace"), "as Althaus has recalled if we should have forgotten, is the Communion of Saints" ("The Church and the Social Problem," p. 44). It is from these false ideas that the thought is further developed that through the Lord's Supper a new being is formed in the Christians, the seed of the resurrection body. The best article that we have so far found which shows how all these false ideas, the denial of the "none other than," the false doctrine of the so-called "visible side" of the invisible Church, and the false idea of a physical effect of the Lord's Supper all hang together is by Father Brunn in "Evangelisch-lutherische Mission und Kirche," 5 Jahrgang (1870), pp. 71-80; 84-89; "Katechismuserklaerung," p. 591ff. Dr. Reu says in connection with I Cor. 11:29f, "**Perhaps** we may be allowed to infer from this physical result of unworthy eating that a worthy participation in the Lord's Supper will also have a physical effect (Ignatius: medicine of immortality). We would then have another characteristic distinguishing the Lord's Supper from the Word. But the matter is problematical. It would be very difficult to show precisely in what the physical effect consists. It can not be 'a preparation for the resurrection,' because, to mention only one reason, the Scriptures reveal that the resurrection will be Christ's own immediate act of power" (Lutheran Dogmatics, 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 78f).

From the above we see that the Brief Statement's "none other than" was directed not only against the Romanists and the Reformed, but also against the teaching of the synergistic Lutherans. Now its bar against false doctrine has been removed by the Affirmation, and that contrary to the express instruction of our Synod not to dispense "with any doctrinal statement of the Brief Statement."

Of the Church

"THE VISIBLE SIDE OF THE CHURCH" (?)

In paragraph 26 the Affirmation has stricken the words, "In our day some Lutherans speak of two sides of the Church, taking the means of grace to be its 'visible side'" and has changed the Brief Statement to read, "But while the Church is invisible, it is created and preserved through visible means, the means of grace." However, the most important change is found in the following, "The means of grace, therefore, are closely related to the Church, and their use is essential to its very existence here on earth." Here the word "essential" is important. It can in this connection have a twofold meaning. It may mean that the use of the means of grace is necessary and indispensable for the existence of the Church and in that case it would merely repeat the Brief Statement's "the means of grace are necessarily related to the Church, seeing that the Church is created and preserved through them" or the Affirmation's "the Church . . . is created and preserved through visible means, the means of grace." The expression may also mean that the use of the means of grace belongs to and is part of the essence of the Church or of the Church's existence.

We maintain that by striking the Brief Statement's reference to the "visible side" of the Church and by inserting the statement that the use of the means of grace "is essential to its very existence here on earth" the Affirmation has opened the door to the false teaching of a visible side of the Church when defining its essence.

In the Declaration the American Lutheran Church asserted, "We declare that to do so (namely to speak of a visible side of the Church when defining its essence) is not a false doctrine, if by this visible side nothing else is meant than the use of the means of grace." This is the old doctrine of the so-called Toledo Theses of 1907, which read, "According to its real essence the Church is and remains invisible on this earth. Common participation in the means of grace is the necessary form of the Church's appearance and the infallible mark of its existence; and in so far the Church is visible" (Doctrinal Decl., p. 5). In his criticism of these Theses Dr. F. Bente quoted the *Quartalschrift* as follows: "The first thesis immediately shows that the colloquents have made a compromise. The Iowans give in that the Church 'according to its real essence' is the communion of believers and is therefore invisible. For this the Ohioans make them the concession that this—according to its real essence invisible—Church is at the same time visible, namely in so far as 'the common participation in the means of grace' is among other things also the 'necessary form of the Church's appearance.' It is easy to show from the writings of the Iowans that behind this mode of expression the old leaven which is both contrary to Scripture and the Confessions is hidden, which Iowa has always mixed into the pure doctrine of the Church. They want to uphold the delusion that the Church has also a visible side, that it is visible and invisible at the same time" (Lehre & Wehre, 53, p. 281).

In the 1928 edition of "Lutheran Dogmatics," p. 277, Dr. Reu said, "The Church which was founded on Pentecost, is according to its essence, both visible and invisible. For it is essentially the company of those who are united with Christ and one another by the bond of faith and love, but apprehend Christ only through the visible and audible means of grace instituted by himself." In the 1941-42 edition, Vol. II, p. 172, this was changed to read, "The Church which was founded at Pentecost is according to its essence the sum-total of those who through faith are united with the invisible Christ and with another by the bond of love. By the use of the means of grace they become perceivable; but since not all who use the means of grace are true believers, no statistics can ever establish their number with certainty; their existence is and remains to be an article of faith." To this we would add that if the Church is the communion of believers, then the fact that the means of grace are in use at a certain place shows indeed "the place, where the Church may be found" (Pieper in Lehre & Wehre, 35, 137), yet it does not and cannot, either wholly or partially, show who is actually a believer and therefore a member of the Church. Hence it is erroneous to say that the believers become "perceivable" by the use of the means of grace. Furthermore, it is a delusion to say that the use of the means of grace is essential to (in the sense of being part of the essence of) the existence of the Church. To illustrate: Food is essential, i.e., indispensable and necessary to the existence of man, yet food is not part of the essence of man or of his existence. Nor is the use of food part of the essence of man or of his existence.

THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY

Why does the American Lutheran Church insist on clinging to the "visible side" of the invisible Church? Among other things it **thereby safeguards its peculiar doctrine of the ministry, that the commission to preach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments was originally vested in the Christians only in conjunction with the clergy as the representatives of the Word and the Sacraments, the so-called visible side of the invisible Church.**

To whom were the Keys **originally** given? The answer to this question reveals whether the leaven of popery has been entirely cast out of the Church. The Brief Statement says, "Since the Christians are the Church, it is self-evident that they alone originally possess the spiritual gifts and rights which Christ has gained for, and given to, His Church . . . Accordingly, we reject all doctrines by which this spiritual power or any part thereof is adjudged as originally vested in certain individuals or bodies, such as the pope, or the bishops, or the order of the ministry, or the secular lords, or councils, or synods, etc." This paragraph was left unchanged in the Affirmation.

Iowa has always maintained that the Keys were originally given to "the Church in its totality." In 1873 the Davenport Theses declared, "In the doctrine of the ministry we could not admit that according to the Confessions of our Church the office comes about by individual Christians conferring their spiritual priestly rights. In opposition to this we maintain that the public office is conferred by God through the congregation in its totality and essence through the orderly call, because the

'mandate to establish the ministry' is not given to the individual members but to the Church as such." In "Lutheran Dogmatics," Vol. II, p. 195 Dr. Reu says that the office of the public administration of the means of grace was given "to all believers, that is, to the Church." "Since it has been given to the Church, that is, the sum-total of the believers, it is the Church which has the right to establish it. The local congregation is a part of the Church at large, and therefore it must have the same right" (Ibid, II, p. 196). The local congregation "is ready to have a representative of the Church at large present when she extends her call and to verify her call in order that the Church at large knows that the call extended was 'valid' and 'proper'" (Ibid, II, p. 198). This has been explained that if the clergy is not represented when the call is being extended, then the call is not valid. The congregation of itself and by itself does not have the right to call a pastor.

UNIONISM

In 1941 our committee reported to our Synod that the American Lutheran Church commissioners "did not believe that all the Scripture-passages quoted in Par. 21 as condemning unionism are applicable" (Proceedings, 1941, p. 278). Examining the Affirmation we find that it has removed "Matt. 7:15" after the words, "All Christians are required by God to discriminate between orthodox and heterodox church bodies," and that it has removed "Rom. 16:17" after the words, "to have church fellowship only with orthodox church bodies, and, in case they have strayed into heterodox church bodies, to leave them." Why? Because it has been maintained, as we shall prove later, that these passages cannot be applied to heretodox "Christians." The Affirmation has also added to the Brief Statement's definition of unionism the following, "or, in other words, joint work and worship by which the truth is either denied or the appearance of denial or at least of indifferentism is given." These words are found in "Toward Lutheran Union," p. 152. In this booklet it is stated (p. 148), "The expression 'unionism' and its exact definition are fixed not by Scripture but by the usage of language in the Church." Now it is true, the term "unionism" is not found in the Scripture, but it is also true that at various times not only the doctrine but also the language within the Church has been divested of its Scriptural content. However, in the confession of the Church the term should be used and defined only in agreement with Scripture, i.e., nothing must be put into this term which goes beyond Scripture and on the other hand it must be so defined that it contains all that Scripture includes in this idea.

In this connection we may add that "Toward Lutheran Union," p. 195 refers to a definition of unionism also found in "Concordia Cyclo-pedia," p. 774, and says that "Dr. H. Hamann points out the fact . . . that the attempt to solve all related problems by the simple definition 'Religious unionism consists in joint worship and work of those not united in doctrine' errs by proving too much." In 1927 The Concordia Cyclo-pedia, p. 774 said, "Religious unionism consists in joint worship and work of those not united in doctrine." In 1931 Dr. Theodore Graebner said, "Unionism is church-fellowship without doctrinal unity . . . In its concrete form it is accordingly the participation of congregations and

church-bodies, of ministers and church officials, in spiritual work and religious worship together with those of differing belief and profession" (C.T.M. II, p. 580). In 1932 Dr. John H. C. Fritz said, "Joining in religious worship or in religious work or in both by such as are not in doctrinal agreement is religious unionism" (Pastoral Theology, p. 219). In 1932 the Brief Statement said, "We repudiate unionism, that is, church fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine." But in 1943 "Toward Lutheran Union" tells us that these definitions prove "too much" and are therefore erroneous.

A.L.C. ON UNIONISM

The Affirmation's definition of unionism is more or less the position of Dr. Reu in his "In the Interest of Lutheran Unity." Dr. Reu distinguished three forms of unionism. The first is described in these words: "We may say that we find unionism wherever the absolute authority of the Scriptures and their unambiguousness with reference to all fundamental doctrines is, in theory or in practice, treated with indifference, wherever wrong views of Biblical doctrines are tolerated (even though one may personally cling to the correct doctrine) for the purpose of establishing fellowship with a church to which one previously refused it, and where one finds a formula of unification which externally unifies the two groups but which is differently interpreted by each of the two groups and, therefore, does not really and truly unite them" (Op. Cit., p. 20f).

We ask: Is this not true of the Affirmation? Has our examination of the Affirmation thus far not proved that it is a formula of unification which is differently interpreted by the American Lutheran Church and by the Missouri Synod? Are the additions to the Brief Statement not wholly ambiguous?

Notice also that Dr. Reu refers only to differences in **fundamental** doctrines. Dr. Reu restricts the clarity of Scripture to fundamental doctrines and maintains that the non-fundamental matters are found in the more or less obscure passages. Therefore the American Lutheran Church declared at Sandusky "that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines" (C.T.M., 1939, p. 59). The American Lutheran Church insists that disagreement in nonfundamental matters does not involve unionism, or as Dr. Reu puts it, "much less with disagreement in non-fundamental points justify separation" (Lutheran Dogmatics, 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 191).

The second form of unionism is described by Dr. Reu as follows: "It is clearly unionistic when with more or less frequency Reformed Christians are admitted to Lutheran pulpits and to Lutheran altars" (Op. cit., p. 21). Note the word "with more or less frequency"! Do these words imply that it is not unionism when it occurs only occasionally? But let us apply this argument of Dr. Reu to the union Good Friday and Thanksgiving services held so often in our communities. At such a service there is hymn-singing, Scripture-reading, prayer and a sermon. Would Dr. Reu have regarded it as unionistic if Reformed Christians would be admitted to Lutheran pulpits once every five or six years? As a rule these union services are held in a different church every year. And what about a Lutheran pastor taking part in a union service in some Reformed

church? As every one knows who has followed its history, the so-called Galesburg Rule, subscribed to by the American Lutheran Church in the Minneapolis Theses, does not hinder a Lutheran pastor from preaching in the pulpit of other churches, "unless the circumstances imply, or seem to imply, a fellowship with error or schism, or a restriction on the unre-served expression of the whole counsel of God" (Bente, American Lu-theranism, Vol. II, p. 202). Expressed in the words of the Affirmation, a Lutheran pastor or Christian can take part in any service or worship as long as he does not deny the truth and does not give the appearance of denial or of indifferentism. Now it is true our fathers rightly sanc-tioned testifying to the Reformed, Catholics, and others, under certain well-defined conditions. But does not this definition of unionism permit such exceptional cases to be made the rule? Does this definition not open the door to practically every form of unionism? Does it not permit a Lutheran pastor to take part in any service or worship with any "Chris-tian" as long as he by word or deed confesses his faith?

The third form of unionism is described by Dr. Reu in the words: "While the two forms of unionism discussed above involve indifference over against doctrinal distinctions between Lutherans and Reformed, there may be similar indifference over against Biblical truth within the Lutheran Church, which may prevent those who wish to cling to the Confessions, from entering into, or remaining in, fellowship with certain parts of the Lutheran Church" (Op. cit., p. 24). This, says Dr. Reu, is what separates the American Lutheran Church from the Lutheran churches of Germany and from the United Lutheran Church of America. In this connection Dr. Reu referred to his attendance at the Lutheran World Convention in 1923, 1927 and 1935, and insisted, since it was a free conference and since he had borne testimony to the truth, therefore his taking part in such a convention was not unionism. "It is obvious that membership in the Lutheran World Convention does not involve unionism—unless prayer fellowship with those who confess the second article of our Catechism, as sincerely as we do, but otherwise retain asso-ciations which we must reject, be defined as unionism" (Ibid., p. 30). What shall we say to all this? Examining the official report of the first Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach in 1923, we find that the conven-tion was opened with a divine service and that such services were held every morning. The sessions were opened with the singing of a hymn, entitled "Herz und Herz vereint zusammen," the reading of Eph. 4:3ff, and a prayer. "Here," said Bishop Ludwigs of Aalborg, "we have made the unity of the Lutheran Church plain to the whole world" (Report, p. 117). "This essential unity of the Lutheran Church all over the world," said Dr. Wentz in the closing session, "is one of the most distinct impres-sions gained by the delegates of this the first Ecumenical Council of the Lutheran Church" (Report, p. 177).

MISSOURI'S POSITION REJECTED

Addressing the Missourians present at the intersynodical conference, Dr. Reu said, "Some of you have the opinion that it is unionistic to co-operate, or even merely to pray, with someone with whom one does not agree in all points of doctrine" (Op. cit., p. 31). "The notion that those who wish to enjoy church fellowship must agree in all points of doc-

trine, rests upon an erroneous interpretation of I Cor. 1:10 and similar Scripture texts" (Ibid., p. 32). Dr. Reu merely draws conclusions from certain Scripture passages and has no direct Scripture passage which forbids unionism, for, according to him, all those passages usually quoted in our circles against unionism cannot be applied to Christians, especially not to Lutherans. We noted before that the Affirmation has struck both Matt. 7:15 and Rom. 16:17 from the first sentence in Par. 29. It cannot be argued that Rom. 16:17 was removed because it was cited a second time in that paragraph. In the first paragraph the Affirmation refers to 2 Tim. 3:16 three times and to 2 Pet. 1:21 twice. The same is true of John 10:35 and I Cor. 2:13. These passages were repeated because they were proof-texts of the preceding statements. Why have they been removed? Can the following be the answer? Dr. Reu says, "It is unthinkable that this text (Matt. 7:15) refers to the sincere Christians in other denominations, and still more unthinkable in the case of Lutheran believers who may disagree with me in certain questions of dogmatics" (Op. cit., p. 40). Matt. 7:15 was quoted in the Brief Statement as proof-text after the words, "all Christians are required by God to discriminate between orthodox and heterodox church bodies." Regarding Rom. 16:17 Dr. Reu said, "What we find here in Romans 16, then, is a serious warning against those who teach righteousness by works instead of the New Testament doctrine of grace. It is not a warning against any kind of heresy, but against one very specific error; it is an admonition to cling to the central doctrine of the New Testament, not to all sorts of individual doctrines somewhere in the outer circumference of the doctrinal system. Therefore we are not justified in finding here a reference to fellow Lutherans who cling to the basic doctrine of the New Testament with the same faith as we but do not agree with us in all individual doctrinal points. Strictly speaking, one cannot even infer from this text that we Lutherans are in duty bound to separate from non-Lutherans as long and as far as they retain this basic doctrine of the New Testament; we have this duty, of course, but the present text, in its primary meaning, does not express it. A Lutheran using this text as the ground for refusing to pray with Lutherans who do not subscribe to all his dogmatical views, is obliged to prove, or must be audacious enough to claim, that we who practice prayer fellowship with such Lutherans, serve our belly and not the Lord Jesus Christ, for verse 18 cannot be construed differently than as a characterization of the errorists of verse 17" (Ibid., p. 42f). Rom. 16:17 was quoted by the Brief Statement as proof-text for the statement, "to have church fellowship only with orthodox church bodies, and, in case they have strayed into heterodox church bodies, to leave them." It has been removed from the Affirmation. However, it may be contended that the Affirmation cites Rom. 16:17 towards the end of the paragraph. But in this connection the Brief Statement does not use it as proof-text for its definition of unionism, but it uses it as proof-text for the statement that the practice of unionism involves disobedience to God's command and causes divisions in the Church. In that connection it is also cited by Dr. Reu when he says, "The apostle admonishes the Christians to mark, i.e., carefully to watch those who seek to arouse division and 'traps' which are contrary to the doctrine which they have learned" (Ibid., p. 40). The word "seek" to arouse is of course

only a gloss by Dr. Reu. It is not found in the original Greek, nor in the English text of the Bible.

THE BRIEF STATEMENT ON UNIONISM

In contradistinction to all this, the Brief Statement says, "All Christians are required . . . to have church fellowship only with orthodox church bodies, and, in case they have strayed into heterodox church bodies, to leave them, Rom. 16:17," and defines unionism as "church-fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine." Dr. Pieper says, *Lehre & Wehre*, 73 (1927), p. 318, "That prayer-fellowship presupposes a fellowship in the faith Scripture abundantly teaches, e.g. Rom. 16:17 where the Christians are admonished to avoid those who do not continue in the Apostles' doctrine but expound their own thoughts and thereby cause divisions and offences in the Church of God. Whom we are to avoid, with them we also do not practice prayer-fellowship . . . According to Rom. 16:17 the heterodox are such as believe otherwise than what they have been taught by the Apostles." Without any modification and qualification Paul says, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." No Christian has the right to modify or qualify that statement and say that church fellowship is permitted provided the truth is not denied or the appearance of denial or at least of indifferentism is not given. But if it be contended that in order to apply this text to fellow Lutherans we must first prove or have the audacity to claim that such fellow Lutherans are belly servers, we answer as follows: In the first place, no one but God could ordinarily prove that an individual is a belly-server. In the second place, it is not our business to prove that a person is a belly-server. Our business is to examine whether or not an individual teaches anything contrary to the Word of God, and if we find that to be the case, then God says—we do not have to prove it—that such a one is a servant of his own ego. Whoever teaches anything contrary to the Word of God does not render absolute slave-like obedience to Christ but renders obedience to his own belly, his own egotism. Every errorist, in as much and in so far as he teaches error, is a belly-server and not a slave of Christ, rendering unquestioning obedience to His Word. Nor does it make any difference to what church body he belongs. If it becomes evident that a member of the Missouri Synod denies any truth revealed in Scripture, even if the same consists, as Walther puts it, only in a denial that Balaam's ass spoke, and if after due admonition he refuses to recant his error then he is to be avoided. In view of this we can come to only one conclusion: **The Affirmation has opened the door to practically every form of unionism and has thereby emasculated and nullified the command of God in Rom. 16:17.**

Of the Election of Grace

In the controversy with the Calvinists the Lutheran dogmaticians of the Seventeenth century did not present the doctrine of Predestination after the manner of Luther and the Formula of Concord, but reduced the whole doctrine of Predestination to the mere statement that God in eternity has elected to salvation all those of whom He foresaw that they would endure in the faith unto the end. Of this "election *intuitu fidei*, in view of faith," as it was called, Dr. Walther said, "It is true, with their '*intuitu fidei*' the later dogmaticians of our Church are far removed from even desiring to solve the mystery of the election decree in a synergistic-Pelagian manner. Rather do they most decidedly renounce such an interpretation of this term . . . But the sad part of it was that with their '*intuitu fidei*' they furnished the real synergists with a shield behind which they could and actually often did hide themselves and still do" (Lehre & Wehre, 26, p. 263f).

ELECTION IN VIEW OF FAITH

In 1881 the Ohio Synod declared "that the foreordination of the elect to eternal life has taken place in view of faith, i.e., in view of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith" (Synodalbericht, Syn. Conf., 1884, p. 21). This was explained by some as though election took place in view of the conduct of man, in view of his refraining from wilful resistance (cf. Lehre & Wehre, 27, p. 167, 185, 402ff; 28, 265). Even as late as 1920 the Wisconsin District of the Ohio Synod taught, "God has been merciful toward all men and will have all men to be saved. How does it come to an election? Through man, because grace cannot perform its work in all men. The fact that in spite of the equally earnest calling, some are not saved is due to their wilful resistance. A natural resistance is found in all men, but God overcomes it. If, however, a man, besides this, resists wilfully, stubbornly, obstinately, the grace of God cannot accomplish anything in him, for it does not force him" (Joint Synod Record, p. 30). Here we clearly have an election in view of man's conduct over against the grace of God. The deciding factor being whether man offers only a natural or also a wilful resistance. To this we may add that when the Chicago Theses of 1928 declared that what Scripture and the Confessions call election has not taken place in view of faith, this was not accepted by all representatives of the Ohio Synod, and for that reason we still find some older members of the former Ohio Synod clinging to the "*intuitu fidei*" theory.

At first the Iowa Synod also taught the "*intuitu fidei*" theory, but gradually Dr. G. Fritschel developed a new method of viewing predestination. Already in 1893 he declared, "The Iowa Synod also teaches the particularism of predestination, but maintains with the Confessions that it is nevertheless the same gracious will as the universal. According to the latter, God will have all men to be saved, yet not unconditionally but in the order of faith. Now since He knows from eternity how many there are who suffer themselves to be saved within this order, the uni-

versal will to save all believers becomes the will to save just a certain number. The universal will thus becomes particular without suffering any alteration, but simply by passing under the aspect of the divine knowledge" (*Unterscheidungslehren*, p. 64). Here the "*intuitu fidei*" still lurks in the background, but predestination is now defined as the universal will of God to procure salvation for all men through Christ and in the order of faith to give salvation and glorification to them that believe. It becomes particular in those who are actually brought to faith. The former was designated as predestination in the wider sense and the latter as predestination in the narrower sense. Because of this peculiar teaching—it certainly is not the doctrine of the Formula of Concord even though it does to some extent accommodate itself to its language—the Iowa Synod was now willing to admit that the Formula of Concord did not teach an election "*intuitu fidei*" and was also willing to disregard the use of the term. And why not? It did not need this expression any more, for the idea of a dissimilar conduct was nicely taken care of in the answer to the question: How does the universal will of grace become a particular predestination? "Since the grace of God is not 'irresistible,' therefore man can wilfully resist the grace of God and thus frustrate his election, but he does not have to do so. If he resists only naturally then the grace of God can bring him to faith, and thus he is numbered among the elect. This we may add, is the doctrine of election as found in the 1925 edition of the Chicago Theses (cf. especially "*Erklaerung ueber das intuitu fidei finalis*," p. 11).

THE CHICAGO THESES

The original Chicago Theses of 1925 were not acceptable to our Synod and therefore our committee suggested various changes and completely rewrote the declaration regarding the "*intuitu fidei finalis*." We shall have to quote the final draft of this declaration in detail, for it forms the basis of the Affirmation's addition to Par. 36 of the Brief Statement. "1) If the term 'election or selection in view of persevering faith (*intuitu fidei finalis*)' is interpreted in this manner only, that God has decreed from eternity to give on Judgment Day—for the sake of the merits of Christ imputed to them—the crown of glory to those whom He himself by His grace has brought to faith and has kept in faith unto the end, and whom by virtue of His omniscience He knows from eternity, —then such an interpretation expresses indeed a truth which is clearly revealed in Scripture, and which, moreover, as far as it concerns the last of the decrees passed by God regarding the elect, can indeed be included in election or predestination unto the adoption of children and unto salvation. But neither in Scripture nor in the Confessions is this action called election or predestination unto adoption and salvation. What Scripture and the Confessions call election has not taken place '*intuitu fidei*.' 2) It is wrong to call the truths just outlined a second form of the doctrine of God's election and predestination unto adoption of children and unto salvation; yea, rather we are confronted with two entirely different truths, which cannot be designated by one term without creating boundless confusion." The Chicago Theses then show the difference between these two truths in seven different paragraphs (cf. *Doctrinal Declar.*, p. 34-35). The first paragraph was left practically unchanged from the 1925 edition, and yet the Examining Committee for Intersyn-

odical Theses reported to our Synod, "In the declaration regarding the 'intuitu fidei finalis' your committee has especially this to criticize: The attempt to distinguish clearly between the election and a so-called decree of God to receive into heaven those who believe unto their end, has failed. Especially in point 1 are they rather jumbled together instead of being separated" (Reports and Memorials, 1929, p. 132). Yet point 1, to which the Examining Committee especially referred, finds its way back through the Declaration into the Affirmation. The Affirmation merely repeats the words of the Declaration.

Comparing the Affirmation with the Chicago Theses we have the following results: (we shall point out in bold print the words of the Affirmation not found in the Chicago Theses and add the words of the Chicago Theses not found in the Affirmation in parentheses): **"It is true,** if the term 'election (C.T. added: 'or selection') in view of persevering faith (intuitu fidei finalis)' is interpreted in this manner only, that God has decreed from eternity to give on Judgment Day, for the sake of the merits of Christ imputed to them, the crown of glory to those whom He himself by His grace has brought to faith and has kept in faith unto the end (C.T. added: "and whom by virtue of His omniscience He knows from eternity"), then such an interpretation expresses indeed a truth (C.T. added: "which is") clearly revealed in Scripture. **It is also true that the Scripture doctrine of election includes as the final step the glorification of the elect.** (C.T. expressed the last sentence in the words: "and which, moreover, as far as it concerns the last of the decrees passed by God regarding the elect, can indeed be included in election or predestination unto the adoption of children and unto salvation" and added the sentence: "But neither in Scripture nor in the Confessions is this action called election or predestination unto adoption and salvation"). **But Scripture and the Confessions do not say that the election, or predestination unto the adoption of children, took place in view of faith.** (C.T. expressed it thus: "What Scripture and the Confessions call election has not taken place 'intuitu fidei'") **Hence, for the sake of clarity in doctrinal presentation this terminology should be avoided.** (C.T. expressed this in a separate paragraph: "5) Accordingly, the only way to establish peace in the Church is for all to accustom themselves to speak as the Scriptures and the Confessions speak")."

From the above we see that the Affirmation really got rid of the use of the term *intuitu fidei*. But at what a cost? Removed has been the sentence, found already in the 1925 edition of the Chicago Theses, "But neither in Scripture nor in the Confessions is this action called election or predestination unto adoption and salvation." The 1928 edition of the Chicago Theses even added, "We are confronted with two entirely different truths, which cannot be designated by one term without creating boundless confusion." All this, originally removed by Dr. Reu in the Declaration, is again left out in the Affirmation. Therefore we can draw only one legitimate conclusion: **The Affirmation, instead of distinguishing clearly between election and a so-called decision of God to receive into heaven those who believe unto their end, insists on being permitted to "jumble them together" and thus makes room for the teaching of a doctrine of justification as a doctrine of election, so long as the mere terminology "in view of faith" has been avoided.**

IOWA'S DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION

"That God has decreed from eternity to give on Judgment Day, for the sake of the merits of Christ imputed to them, the crown of glory to those whom He himself by His grace has brought to faith and has kept in the faith unto the end,"*—of which the Chicago Theses said that it should not be called, and should not be confused with, election or predestination—is the doctrine of election found in Dr. Reu's "Lutheran Dogmatics." He says, "Because the Triune God foresaw that man would fall from communion with Him, He has, from eternity, decreed to restore fallen mankind to this communion. He has decreed to accomplish the salvation of men, to apply it to them, and to bring about its eternal consummation (Will or decree of salvation, voluntas salutis, Heilsratschluss)" (1941-42 ed., Vol. I, p. 60). Here Dr. Reu clearly confounds the universal will of grace with a decree of election, for he continues, "This eternal will of God is a 'universal will' according to which God willed from eternity to procure by Christ salvation for all, by creating faith earnestly and sincerely ('serious and sincere will'), but not irresistibly ('irresistible grace') to apply it to all, and by co-operation of the Spirit to preserve all believers in the true faith and to glorify them by introduction into eternal life" (Ibid., I, p. 63). Dr. Reu maintains that "conversion," "regeneration," "call," "illumination," and "election" are "synonyms" and that "each of them stresses one specific phase of the Spirit's work or one specific aspect of the process of salvation" (Ibid., II, p. 88f). "Election" is generally identical with 'effective call' . . . It also denotes "inclusion among those who persevere in faith unto the end" (Ibid., II, p. 91). "In addition to the universal decree, Scripture also knows of a particular act of eternal predestination or election according to which the fact that we, the believing children of God, have come to faith and will finally be saved is due to nothing whatever in ourselves nor to anything whatsoever that we have done or left undone, omitted or not omitted, with natural powers or with so-called 'powers of grace bestowed upon us' here in this life, but solely and alone to this eternal election and purpose of God" (Ibid., II, p. 138). The last part is taken from the Declaration and is undoubtedly an accommodation to Par. 12 of the Brief Statement. However, it purposely does not subscribe to the Brief Statement's rejection of a "lesser guilt or less evil conduct as compared with others, his refraining from wilful resistance," which, as we have seen, is the real reason according to Dr. Reu why one is converted and not the other. "Scripture makes no definite statement concerning the relation between the eternal predestination of the children of God and the universal will of salvation. The frequently employed 'intuitu fidei' is not expressed in Scripture, but is simply a human construction."—Iowa has for many years been willing to discard the use of the "intuitu fidei"—"One cannot deny that the act of divine election is an act of will distinct from the universal will of salvation. To desire earnestly that salvation be offered to all, and that faith should be created and preserved in all, is one thing; the act of will by which God actually elects and predestines to faith and to salvation is something different, something additional. Because the latter statement is a Scripture truth as well as the former, it must be maintained, not, indeed, 'with equal emphasis'—that is an

*The exact words of the Affirmation.

incorrect translation in the 'Declaration' of the American Lutheran Church accepted 1938 at Sandusky—but 'with equal seriousness' (mit gleichem Ernst) as the original German text had it. If we maintain both, the problem as to the relation of these two acts of will to another arises, all the more so since, to the human mind, they seem to be mutually contradictory. According to the one, God wills the faith and salvation of all, not irresistibly, it is true, but seriously and efficaciously; according to the other, God has from eternity elected only those who have actually come to faith, and has from eternity predestined them to faith, sonship and eternal salvation" (Ibid., II, p. 142f). "Particular predestination is carried out on the way of the universal will of salvation which knows no 'irresistible grace' much less that there are people whom God does not earnestly desire to save . . . The conclusion may be drawn from the preceding, that particular predestination does not lie outside the universal will of salvation but within" (Ibid., II, p. 145).

FALSE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION SAFEGUARDED

This doctrine of predestination which is certainly not the doctrine of the Formula of Concord is **expressly rejected in the Brief Statement** (Par. 39), "By election of Grace, Scripture does not mean that **one** part of God's counsel of salvation according to which He will receive into heaven those who persevere in faith unto the end, but, on the contrary, Scripture means this, that God, before the foundation of the world, from pure grace, because of the redemption of Christ, has chosen for His own a definite number of persons out of the corrupt mass and has determined to bring them, through Word and Sacrament, to faith and salvation." However Dr. Reu's so-called doctrine of predestination serves the useful purpose of safeguarding the synergism expressly condemned in paragraph 12 of the Brief Statement. Note Dr. Reu's emphasis on the rejection of irresistible grace in the doctrine of predestination. Recall what Dr. Reu said when treating of conversion.

But are we not doing Dr. Reu an injustice? Does Dr. Reu actually teach that predestination as the universal gracious will of God is made particular, or that predestination is the universal will of God which attains its end, in those who do nothing worse than naturally resist the grace of God? Dr. Reu says, "God does not force salvation upon anyone, and their resistance is a possible, though not a necessary nor unavoidable aggravation of natural resistance, i.e., it is their own guilt . . . While natural man never by his own reason or strength can decide for Christ and believe Him, he can refuse and resist when the Word of God intends to increase faith in him," and, we would add, that is the only thing he can do. "The eternal saving will of God is universal, but in its enactment it becomes particular by the willful and persistent resistance of man" (Vol. I, p. 72). Read the last sentence once more! The universal will of God becomes a particular predestination and attains its end in all those who do not resist wilfully but only naturally.

This false doctrine concerning predestination is also safeguarded in Par. 39 of the Affirmation. The Brief Statement's "the election of grace attains its end with all whom it embraces" has been changed in the Affirmation to read, "it" (**The universal will of grace**) "does attain its end in all those embraced in the election of grace."

AFFIRMATION INSISTS ON HARMONIZING

The Affirmation also insists that the proper relation of the universal will of grace and God's election of grace be observed, instead of merely, with the Brief Statement, properly **distinguishing** between these two truths.

Following the Formula of Concord, Missouri distinguishes between these two Scriptural truths, for both truths have their proper use: if we want to convert the sinner we remind him of the universal will of grace, but if we want to comfort the believer we remind him of his election (cf. Lehre & Wehre, 50, 68). Dr. Bente rightly says, "The will of grace and the election of grace are according to Missouri not two different words for the same thing, but two different ideas, two different things. The will of grace and the election of grace are according to Scripture, the Confessions, and Missouri doctrine neither identical nor synonymous. A person can never put one in the place of the other without changing the idea itself" (Lehre & Wehre, 50, 355). Missouri insists that the two do not contradict each other, and yet it does not try to harmonize the two, for every effort to do so will cause a person to fall either into the ditch of Calvinism or into the ditch of Synergism. Therefore the Brief Statement declares in the same paragraph, "Scripture, however, while distinguishing between the universal will of grace and the election of grace does not place the two in opposition to each other. On the contrary, it teaches that the grace dealing with those who are lost is altogether earnest and fully efficacious for conversion. Blind reason indeed declares these two truths to be contradictory; but we impose silence on our reason. The seeming disharmony will disappear in the light of heaven."

In contradiction to all this, Ohio and Iowa have always insisted that the proper relation between these two truths must be maintained, as the Declaration says, "with equal emphasis" ("seriousness," as Dr. Reu would have it). Particular predestination lies within the universal will of salvation. According to Ohio and Iowa there is really no mystery between the universal will of grace and the election of grace, for those who resist only naturally are converted and therefore elected; those who resist wilfully are not converted and therefore not elected. The American Lutheran Church knows only of a "psychological" mystery, namely, why is it, since all men naturally resist the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost, that in some this natural resistance becomes a wilful resistance? This error is expressly condemned in Par. 15 of the Brief Statement (cf. Lehre & Wehre, 34, p. 39; 59, 534ff; 60, 198ff). Because Missouri has always opposed every effort to harmonize these two Scriptural truths it has been accused by Ohio and Iowa of teaching two contradictory wills. Thesis VIa of the Toledo Theses reads, "The error of Missouri on predestination we find to consist in this, that thereby the universal gracious will of God and His decree of election are so separated as to exclude one another and that thus two contradictory wills are affirmed of God. This error renders unsafe the foundation upon which our salvation is based and stamps as fundamentally wrong other statements which might otherwise admit of an acceptable interpretation" (Doctrinal Decl., p. 6). We would call our reader's attention to Dr. Pieper's criticism of this thesis in Lehre & Wehre, 39, p. 262 and especially his article entitled,

"Weshalb erheben die Synergisten gegen die Lutheraner die Beschuldigung, dass die letzteren 'contradictoriae voluntates' in Gott setzten?" (Lehre & Wehre, 39, p. 206-9).

All this has now been introduced into the Affirmation. Therefore we must conclude that thereby the Affirmation has made room for the anti-scriptural doctrine consistently held within the American Lutheran Church, namely, **that the Universal Will of Grace becomes a particular election of grace by the "wilful" resistance as distinguished from the mere "natural" resistance of unconverted man.**

A STRANGE VIEW OF ELECTION

The peculiar view of "election" as held by the American Lutheran Church is also introduced into Par. 41 of the Affirmation. According to Luther and the Lutheran Confessions there is a wrong and a right way of viewing predestination. The former consists in speculating about the secret counsel of God outside of His Word; the latter seeks to find our election in the revealed Word of God, by following step by step the "order of salvation," the eight steps of the 11th article of the Formula. Iowa, however, knows nothing of a right and a wrong way and speaks of viewing predestination before creation, from the standpoint of eternity, and from the present time, from the standpoint of a believer. The Declaration says, "When Scripture speaks of this eternal election, it, as a rule, takes its position in time, after men have come to faith, and in presenting this doctrine, Scripture addresses itself only to believers." From the words "as a rule" we can only conclude that Scripture has two ways of presenting the doctrine of election, occasionally presenting it from the standpoint of eternity but more often from the standpoint of time. Neither the Formula of Concord nor the Brief Statement know anything of viewing God's will from two different standpoints, but only of a wrong and a right way. **Yet this peculiar view of Iowa is now introduced into the Affirmation.**

In this paragraph the Brief Statement shows how the individual may attain the assurance of his eternal election. After rejecting the wrong method ("election is not to be considered 'in a bare manner—nude,—as though God only held a muster, thus: This one shall be saved, that one shall be damned.'") it refers to the right method ("The Scriptures teach this doctrine in no other way than to direct us thereby to the Word," etc.). Here the Brief Statement ends. But now the Affirmation introduces the peculiar Iowan method of viewing election, and then, continuing, cites, I Cor. 2:7; I Pet. 1:5. In explanation of this peculiar use of I Cor. 2:7 we have found the following in "Lutheran Dogmatics," 1928 ed., p. 41; "But even the consummation of salvation . . . is according to the Scriptures contingent upon the eternal decree of God: for instance in I Cor. 2:7—where 'wisdom' denotes the eternal decree of salvation, and 'glorification' refers to eternal glorification." In the 1941-42 ed., Vol. I, p. 61f, we read, "But even the consummation of salvation (Vollendung des Heils) that is, the fact that all those who believe in Christ and thus partake of the salvation wrought by Christ, are perfected and finally brought to the enjoyment of everlasting blessedness, and all traces of sin will be done away with, is according to Scripture based upon the eternal will of God. In I Cor. 2:7 Paul, using the term 'wisdom' instead of divine

plan or will, says the divine plan aimed before all times at the glorification of the believers, at the attainment of eternal glory." In this connection we may add that according to Dr. Reu the doing away with the traces of sin goes on in the believer even after death. He says, "The soul is in communion with the Lord; it has entered the state of rest, and is free from sin and evil, it digests, so to speak, the impressions of its earthly life, and the wounds caused by sin gradually heal. **Possibly** we may assume that the fellowship with Christ increasingly sanctifies the soul, and that the habits of sin, which were found even in the departing believer, are now ultimately exterminated—we do not know" (1941-42 ed., Vol. II, p. 227; 1928 ed., p. 305).

This idea of a purgation after death is a typical example of Dr. Reu's speculative theology which we meet so often in his "Lutheran Dogmatics."

Of the Last Things

MISSOURI REJECTS IOWA'S CHILIASM

The Iowa Synod has always maintained that the peculiar teaching tolerated in its midst regarding the conversion of the Jews, a still future great and final Antichrist, a twofold resurrection, and a twofold advent of Christ did not involve clearly revealed doctrines of Scripture but were mere exegetical questions and theological problems. In 1864 the Iowa Synod declared, "We regard and treat the doctrine of a conversion of Israel, and of the millennium—concerning which there are different opinions within the Lutheran Church even among those who hold decidedly to the Confessions of the Church—as exegetical questions and theological problems on which a person may have a different opinion without thereby disrupting church fellowship" (Beyer, Colloquium, p. 133). This kind of chiliasm, which includes a future conversion of the Jews, a still future great and final Antichrist, a twofold resurrection, and the expectation of a twofold future advent of Christ was called "subtle" by the Iowans; but the Missourians declared that they looked upon this "intermediate" form of chiliasm as being a "crass" chiliasm (Ibid., p. 171). Dr. Walther said, "This chiliasm I can not regard as problematical. It is true, I regard as such that chiliasm which the fathers called 'subtle,' but a chiliasm which teaches that a twofold resurrection and a twofold advent of Christ are still to be expected, I do not regard as a problem, but as an erroneous opinion which is rejected in Scripture and in the Symbols" (Ibid., p. 135). "Such a chiliasm cannot be tolerated. As dear as the unity of the church is to us, the truth and our salvation must be even dearer to us" (Ibid., p. 136).

The exact form of chiliasm which our forefathers condemned as a "crass" chiliasm has been taught these many years at Wartburg Seminary by the author of the Declaration (cf. Lutheran Dogmatics, 1928 ed., pp. 305-318; 1941-42 ed., Vol. II, pp. 228-247; there is no difference between the two editions). Dr. Reu's chapter entitled "The Preliminary Perfection of the Kingdom of God" contains the following subheads: 1. Before the Kingdom of God will be consummated, the gospel must be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all nations. 2. The proclamation of the gospel among all nations is followed by the conversion of Israel. 3. Other events which according to the Scriptures shall take place during the final period are the general apostasy within Christendom and the appearance of the Antichrist. 4. Antichrist will be vanquished by Christ who will also cause the first resurrection. 5. The overthrow of Antichrist and the first resurrection are followed by the preliminary consummation of the kingdom of God, the millennial reign of the saints with Christ. 6. The millennium is followed by the final crisis, through which the church passes to actual perfection. Dr. Reu expressly says, "Not a few of the points discussed in this chapter pertain to the realm of open questions, i.e., questions which need not disrupt church fellowship" (1928 ed., p. 317; 1941-42 ed., II, p. 246).

DOES A.L.C. DECLARATION REJECT CHILIASM?

In Par. 43 the Affirmation repeats the words of the Declaration with the following changes: "Concerning the Last Things we believe that the following truths are fundamental: (Declaration: "Nothing should be taught concerning the subjects named in our introductory sentence that would involve a negation of the following truths"): a. That as Christians we must at all times be ready for the return of Christ to judgment; (Decl. omits: "to judgment"); b. That as Christians we are bound, until the return of Christ to judgment (Decl. omits: "to judgment") to the use of the means of grace and to the way of salvation revealed in the Gospel; c. That the Church on earth until the return of Christ to judgment (Decl. omits: "to judgment") will continue to be a kingdom of the cross.

In 1938 Committee 16 reported to Synod, "Their Declaration repudiates chiliasm by emphasizing that the Church will continue to be a kingdom of the cross until the end and by asserting that 'Christians must at all times be ready for the return of Christ'" (Proceedings, 1938, p. 230). Do these words repudiate chiliasm? Dr. Reu says, "At the same time, Satan is bound on earth, i.e., he does not possess the same freedom of action and power of temptation and cannot in his accustomed manner arouse the nations' hatred against the Church. That Satan is bound is very likely an effect of Christ's majestic reign. It would be surprising if the believers would not gladly and actively make use of this opportunity to do missionary work among those who have been left alive in the judgment upon Antichrist and have not as yet come to faith. If this missionary activity would be crowned with great success, this too would have to be ascribed to the reign of Christ, although the Word does not coerce anyone and may be resisted. Precisely as the believers can neither comprehend Christ nor remain in His fellowship except through Word and Sacraments, so also they employ no other means of missionary activity except Word and Sacraments. Sin and death will still exist, also in many hearts resistance against God and His Word. The order of salvation has not been abolished, nor have cross and affliction been removed from the church as appears from the fact that at the very end it will have to endure the onslaught of those who even during this time have closed their hearts against Christ" (Op. cit., 1941-42 ed., II, p. 244f; 1928 ed., p. 316f). These words clearly show that Committee 16 was mistaken; for the words of the Declaration referred to by our committee do not repudiate chiliasm and did not hinder Dr. Reu from teaching his brand of chiliasm.

THE QUESTION OF NON-FUNDAMENTALS

By merely changing the words of the Declaration to read, "the following truths are fundamental" the Affirmation has opened the door to the fundamental error of the American Lutheran Church "that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines" (C.T.M., 1939, p. 59). If only the three truths mentioned by the Affirmation are regarded as "fundamental" in this section, then everything beyond these three truths in this section is non-fundamental, an open question, a theological problem. This has always been the position of the former Iowa Synod. In *Lehre & Wehre*, 34, p. 199 Dr. Pieper writes, "Walther insisted most decisively that nothing be declared an open ques-

tion and treated as such which is clearly taught in God's Word and thereby decided by the Word of God. And here indeed there is no difference as to whether the question pertains to a fundamental or a non-fundamental doctrine. For here it is a question of the principle of Scripture, namely, whether everything which God has prescribed in Scripture for man to believe is to be accepted by man in faith. Walther writes, 'We can not regard and treat any doctrine which is clearly taught in God's Word or which contradicts God's clear Word as an open question, even though the same appears to be or actually is, ever so subordinate, and which lies ever so far from the center of saving doctrine, in its periphery' (L. & W., 14, p. 66). And immediately afterwards, 'We maintain that no error contrary to God's clear Word dare be tolerated within the orthodox Church, that it dare not be made a matter of individual liberty within the orthodox Church to deviate even in the smallest point from God's clear Word, be it negatively or positively, directly or indirectly, that every deviation from the clear Word of God, even if the same consisted only in a denial that Balaam's ass spoke, demands on the contrary that steps be taken against it within the orthodox Church, and that when all instruction, admonition, warning, threatening and all patience have proved themselves unproductive and ineffective in persuading the person or communion to give up their contradiction to God's clear Word, it must finally end with an excommunication, resp., a schism' (Ibid., p. 68)."

WHICH TYPES OF CHILIASM ARE REJECTED?

Turning our attention to Par. 44 of the Affirmation we find that the Brief Statement has been so altered that **while rejecting certain forms of chiliasm it safeguards and opens the door to that anti-scriptural form of chiliasm taught and advocated, for instance, by the late Dr. Reu in all editions of his "Lutheran Dogmatics."** The Brief Statement closed this paragraph with the words, "According to these clear passages of Scripture we reject the **whole** of Millennialism, since it not only contradicts Scripture, but also engenders a false conception of the kingdom of Christ, turns the hope of Christians upon earthly goals (I Cor. 15:19; Col. 3:2), and leads them to look upon the Bible as an obscure book." The word "whole" makes this statement all-inclusive. It rejects chiliasm as a whole and in all its forms, and like a broadside it can't miss any form of chiliasm. But this statement **has been removed** by the Affirmation and the rest of the paragraph has been so altered and restricted that the shots go wild and absolutely miss the chiliasm taught and advocated by Dr. Reu. The Brief Statement read, "We reject every type of Millennialism, or Chiliasm, the opinions that" etc. This was changed to read, "We reject every type . . . which teaches that" etc. **Thereby the rejection was narrowed down and restricted to the chiliasm described in the words which follow.** And here, as we said, every shot is a miss.

The first type of chiliasm rejected is described as teaching "that Christ will return visibly to this earth a thousand years before the end of the world and establish a dominion of the Church over the world." Dr. Reu did not expressly teach that Christ would return **visibly** before the Judgment Day, even though he was willing to allow the premillennarian view. He says, "When the afflictions of the Christians have be-

come most grievous and Antichrist's presumption has reached its peak, then Christ will intervene and terminate Antichrist's rule. According to Revelation, this will be accomplished through his return, for the rider of the white horse is none other than Christ (Rev. 19:16 and cf. Rev. 19:11 and 3:14). He goes forth to war against Antichrist and his ally, the false prophet; he casts both of them into the lake of fire, i.e., damnation, and binds Satan the old serpent, who is the power behind both of them, for a period of 1,000 years. This is the only 'return' of Christ which the Apocalypse discusses. Also according to Paul (II Thess. 2:8, the return of Christ occurs at this point: 'Christ will bring Antichrist to nought by the manifestation of his Parousia.' According to the last discourses of Christ, however, the return of Christ appears as the very last event in the present era, followed immediately by the resurrection of all men and the last judgment. Now it is not impossible that we have here a case similar to the conception of the Day of Yahveh which in the Old Testament appears as one day, but in the fulfilment divides itself into two acts or periods, all the more so since it is the same Jesus who speaks in the Gospel and in Revelation (Rev. 1:1-3). Christ in his discourses would compress into one single event what John and Paul divide into two: this might be understood in such a sense that II Thess. 2:8 and Rev. 19 merely describe a special deed of power but not the actual return of Christ and that the return itself will occur only at a later time, viz., immediately before the universal resurrection and the judgment; or it might be understood in the sense that this intervention for the purpose of vanquishing Satan is the real return of Christ and that the final defeat of Satan (20:7) is to be understood as special, miraculous deed of him who has already returned. I do not know; but I regard the former of these views as more probable. The figurative diction of the Apocalypse would allow this interpretation, nor would Paul's expression (II Thess. 2:8) 'the manifestation of his parousia' militate against it; one might also recall that Christ's 'coming' unto his disciples foretold in John 14:18 was fulfilled through the special act of the exalted when amid signs and wonders he sent the Holy Spirit" (Op. cit. II, p. 240f).

The second type of chiliasm which is rejected by the Affirmation is described as teaching "that before the end of the world the Church will enjoy a season of special prosperity." Dr. Reu did not teach that. Dr. Reu says, "The number of those who are won for the Lord may be large (Rev. 7:3-10), yet in comparison with those who resist till the end, it will be only a 'remnant': Isaiah's 'Shearjashub' (7:3; 10:21; cp. Rom. 9:27) will not be modified, and the notions of the universal conversion of mankind are idle dreams" (Op. cit. II, p. 229). Referring to the so-called Millennium he says, "It would be surprising if the believers would not gladly and actively make use of this opportunity to do missionary work among those who have been left alive in the judgment upon Antichrist and have not as yet come to faith. If (note the if!) this missionary activity would be crowned with great success, this too would have to be ascribed to the reign of Christ, although the Word does not coerce anyone and may be resisted" (Op. cit., II, p. 244).

The third type of chiliasm rejected is described as follows: "that before the general resurrection on Judgment Day a number of departed Christians or martyrs will be raised again to reign in glory in this present

world." By adding the word "present" to the Brief Statement the Affirmation permits Dr. Reu's chiliasm to escape condemnation. Dr. Reu taught, "We do not venture to decide definitely where this reign will be established, whether in heaven or in earth. It is not stated specifically, but the introduction of v. 4 seems to indicate that it is heaven" (Op. cit., II, p. 244).

Now note! The Affirmation adds, "such opinions have no clear Word of Scripture to support them and therefore must not be taught in the Church."

THE THOUSAND YEARS

In this same paragraph the Affirmation has added the statement, "The Thousand Years.—We believe that it is not possible to say with absolute certainty either that the 'thousand years' prophesied in Revelation 20 have already been fulfilled or that they still lie in the future. Whatever interpretation is assumed must be in harmony with the analogy of faith and without chiliastic associations." Iowa has always insisted that to expect a future fulfillment of Rev. 20 is not contrary to the analogy of faith. The Toledo Theses read, "The belief of some, to wit, that the reign of Christ and His saints referred to in Rev. 20 is an event belonging to the future . . . is an opinion which, though not incompatible with the analogy of faith, cannot be strictly proved from Scripture" (Doctr., Decl., p. 6). Commenting on this thesis in 1893 Dr. Pieper said that he would ask only one question: "Did the colloquents also want to say with this thesis that it is not contrary to the analogy of faith, if someone maintains that between our time and the coming of Christ to judgment there are still at least a thousand years?" (Lehre & Wehre, 39, p. 261). It is true, no one can definitely say when the thousand years began and when they will end, "however, as soon as someone today places these thousand years still in the future and in consequence teaches: 'Judgment Day does not come for a long time; first must occur a resurrection of the dead' etc., etc.—as soon as this is taught then the foundation of the faith is subverted" (Synodalbericht, Syn. Conf., 1877, p. 31). Iowa, however, has always insisted that its chiliasm was not contrary to the analogy of faith, hence this statement of the Affirmation does not effect its rejection but rather fosters it. Here someone may contend that the Affirmation specifically rejects every interpretation of Rev. 20 with "chiliastic associations." That, however, does not mean much; for there has always been a great difference of opinion between Iowa and Missouri as to chiliastic notions to be rejected. Iowa has always claimed that Art. XVII of the Augsburg Confession, referred to at the beginning of this paragraph, rejects and condemns only the "crass" chiliasm and not that chiliasm taught within the Iowa Synod. Dr. Reu says, "If some one, on the basis of Augustana XVII, rejects as un-Lutheran the above presentation, we answer that we accept, without qualifications, the condemnation of 'juedische opiniones' which is found there, but we demand that these words be made to express no more than they actually do express" (Op. cit. II, p. 247). Therefore when the Affirmation refers to "chiliastic associations" the Missourians will understand this as referring to all forms of chiliasm, but the Iowans will refer it only to the "crass" form.

THE ANTICHRIST—THE POPE

The Affirmation has made three changes in the first sentence of Par. 45. "As to the Antichrist, we believe (Brief Statement: "teach") that the prophecies of Holy Scriptures in (Brief Statement: "concerning the Antichrist") 2 Thess. 3:3-12; I John 2:18 have found a fulfillment (Brief Statement: "have been fulfilled") in the pope of Rome and his dominion." Here we have the most glaring and flagrant example of how the Affirmation has opened the door to a false teaching. The Brief Statement "teaches"; the Affirmation merely "believes." Iowa has always been willing to let others believe that the pope is the Antichrist, but it has not demanded that its members teach it. To uphold the second change it has been maintained that I John 2:18 speaks of "many antichrists." But the text also speaks of "Antichrist." The third change was obviously made to permit that false teaching **that the Antichrist prophecies have found a partial fulfillment in the pope but will find their real fulfillment in a future personal Antichrist**, for after pronouncing the statement of the Smalcald Articles "that the pope is the very Antichrist" "a historical judgment based upon a clear prophecy of Scripture," the Affirmation adds, "Whether in the future, prior to Christ's return to Judgment, there will be a special unfolding of the antichristian power already present now and thus a still more comprehensive fulfillment of 2 Thess. 2 may occur, we leave to the Lord and Ruler of the Church and of world history."

After describing the future Antichrist as an individual who will appear out of a general apostasy of Christendom Dr. Reu says, "The view here presented can by no means be invalidated by a reference to Luther's well known statement in the Articles of Smalcald. For 1. Luther's statement is purely a historical judgment: it is no exegetical or dogmatical statement, and 2. it is possible that one finds the Biblical marks of the Antichrist to be the characteristics of the pope of Rome and still expects the culmination of anti-Christianity in an actual person of the last days. Whether this actual person proceeds from the institution of the papacy or whether he is a secular ruler is hard to define beforehand, especially since the pope has strong aspirations for secular power. There are more indications that the apostate Church (Rev. 13:11) is the false prophet who through his satanical lying miracles seduces the world to worship the beast, i.e., Antichrist" (Op. cit., II, p. 238). Concerning these two views that the Antichrist prophecies have been partially fulfilled in the papacy and that the real Antichrist may still be expected in the future, Dr. Stoeckhardt writes, "These two statements contradict each other. The prophecy of Scripture 2 Thess. 2, Rev. 13-17, Dan. 11 refers to a concrete historical appearance, or better yet, to an altogether definite historical person, be it an individual person or a collective person. If this person, the real great Antichrist, is yet to come, then he is not identical with the pope; then the prophecy concerning the great Antichrist has neither been initially nor partially fulfilled in the papacy. Then the pope is at the most, as Dr. Deindoerfer calls him, the forerunner of the Antichrist. The forerunner, however, is a different person than he, for whom he prepares the way. John, the forerunner of Christ, was not Christ neither initially nor partially. A person should state clearly that he does not believe that the pope is the real Antichrist

or Endechrist" (Lehre & Wehre, 50, p. 490). "Certainly the fact that the pope has damned and cursed the article of the forgiveness of sin, which is the only comfort of the Christian in life and in death, not only in that bull, but also in his many other writings, as well as in the Decrees of Trent, and that he proclaims this as true and pure doctrine—that is what makes him the first-born of Satan, yes, worse than all devils. That the pope with his work-doctrine, with all his decretals, lies and blasphemies tears Christ, the only Savior of sinners, out of the hearts and consciences of Christians, that makes him the real, true Anti-Christ. Anything worse and more horrible is not even imaginable in the Church. Those theologians who expect of their future Antichrist something worse and more horrible than has been committed by the pope thereby show that their view of the central significance of the 'article of the standing and falling Church,' the article of justification has been dimmed" (Ibid., p. 494).

We noted in the foregoing sentence that Dr. Reu held that "Luther's statement is purely a historical judgment." In 1904 Dr. Deindoerfer declared, "The question concerns rather a human application of the Scripture doctrine of the Antichrist and his conduct and ways which must be clearly distinguished from the Scripture doctrine itself" (Lehre & Wehre, 50, 490). To this Dr. Stoeckhardt answered, "We confidently affirm that it is Scripture doctrine and not the human application of a Scripture doctrine, that the pope is the Antichrist. Here, too, it is a matter of accepting in faith or rejecting a clearly expressed doctrine of Scripture . . . When the prophecy has been fulfilled then faith in the word of prophecy includes also this that a person recognizes and acknowledges the fulfillment of the prophecy . . . We do indeed reproach the theologians who still expect a future Antichrist that they do not understand those words of prophecy and refuse faith and obedience to the same" (Ibid., p. 492).

THE CONVERSION OF ISRAEL

Regarding the doctrine of the conversion of Israel we find that the Affirmation has not only stricken the Brief Statement's rejection of that chiliasm which teaches "that before the end of the world a universal conversion of the Jewish nation (of Israel according to the flesh) will take place," but has also altered the Brief Statement's assertion, "Scripture clearly teaches . . . that there will be no general conversion, a conversion *en masse*, of the Jewish nation," to read, "We believe that there is no sound exegetical basis in Rom. 11:7,25,26 for the assumption that there will ever be a general conversion, a conversion 'en masse,' of the Jewish nation." Thus the Affirmation has made room for the teaching of a universal conversion of the Jews in distinction to a conversion *en masse*. Dr. Little in "Disputed Doctrines," p. 42 says that the doctrine of the conversion of Israel "is a doctrine that is usually incorporated into the doctrine of the Millennium" and that Rom. 11:26 "is supposed to teach the conversion of Israel 'en masse,' although by most of the advocates of the doctrine of the conversion of the Jews in the last times, the word 'all' is interpreted to mean a large number." The Affirmation restricts itself to speaking of a general conversion in the sense of "a conversion *EN MASSE* of the Jewish nation" and does not even reject such a teaching as false doctrine. It merely states that there is no sound exegetical basis for its assumption. Thus room is made for the teaching of Dr. Reu,

more in agreement with the clear statements of Scripture concerning the universal resurrection, as well as with what Scripture records of other saints who were restored to earthly life. Scripture does not say that Lazarus or the young man of Nain or the daughter of Jairus died again, but that is rightly assumed; and therefore it is proper to assume, that the bodies of the saints in Matt. 27:53 later again died a natural death and were returned to the grave to arise in the general resurrection. In short, there is no instance in the Scripture of a resurrection to glory, except that of our Savior, whom the Scripture declare "the first-fruits of them that slept," I Cor. 15:20.

The universality of the resurrection is clearly taught in John 5:28,29; 6:39,40,44; I Cor. 15:22,23, etc. Dr. Stoeckhardt says, "All that are in the grave will simultaneously in one and the same hour hear the voice of the Son of God and simultaneously come forth out of their graves, some to the resurrection of life, others to the resurrection of damnation. Accordingly, there is only one universal resurrection of the dead. And those who insert a period of a thousand years between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked, say the exact opposite of what the Lord says . . . Whoever now insists that the believers will rise a thousand years before Judgment Day calls Christ a liar" (Synodalbericht, Cent. Dist., 1895, p. 89f). That there is no analogy between Matt. 27 and Rev. 20 was pointed out already forty years ago. "It was asked whether the first resurrection mentioned in Rev. 20:4 may not be the resurrection of those who were made alive at the death of Christ and after His resurrection came out of their graves (Matt. 27:52). To this it was answered: those in Rev. 20 are expressly designated as those beheaded for the witness of Christ; Matt. 27 lacks this designation. Furthermore Rev. 20 speaks only of the souls, therefore not of a physical resurrection, but in Matt. 27 it is expressly stated that the bodies of the saints were made alive" (Synodalbericht, Nebr. Dist., 1904, p. 35). The latter point is very important. Matt. 27 speaks of a physical resurrection, but Rev. 20, in a symbolic vision, speaks of a resurrection of souls. Dr. A. L. Graebner says, "We read (v. 4) of the 'souls of them that were beheaded': these lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. Let the chiliast be serious with the word 'souls' and then the whole proof of chiliasm from this passage collapses" (Synodalbericht, West. Dist., 1888, p. 19). Dr. Stoeckhardt declared, "Only the souls of the holy martyrs are here spoken of, in fact of the souls of the righteous who have died, and of a resurrection, a living of these souls, not a resurrection of the flesh. Thus the first resurrection will be nothing else but the translation of the pious souls to the heavenly life" (Synodalbericht, Cent. Dist., 1895, p. 88). From this we learn that the idea of a physical resurrection of martyrs before the Last Day should be wholly rejected. It is contrary to the analogy of faith and has no foundation in Scripture.

Conclusion

We have completed our examination of the Affirmation. The candid reader will agree that this document does not carry out the resolutions of our Synod in 1941. It is not so clearly written so that there can be no misunderstanding in reference to the meaning which the words are to convey. At times, contrary to the express direction of our Synod, it dispenses with certain doctrinal statements of the Brief Statement; at times it merely takes certain ambiguous phrases from the Declaration and inserts them into the Brief Statement; at times it expressly upholds the false teaching of our opponents. In short, instead of defining the truth of Scripture more sharply over against its denial, it blunts the testimony of the Brief Statement and thus makes room for its denial. Hence we cannot subscribe to the Affirmation as our confession of faith.

Our examination has clearly shown that the Affirmation is nothing but a typical Melancthonian document. It is a formula of unification which would outwardly unite the American Lutheran Church with the Missouri Synod, but which would be differently interpreted by each and would not really and truly unite them in the faith. The Affirmation does not remove the doctrinal differences which have existed and which still exist between these two church bodies to this day. It merely hides them. The American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod are not united in the faith in the following doctrines: 1) the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, 2) the doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture, 3) the doctrine of conversion, 4) the doctrine of the means of grace, 5) the doctrine of the object of the Lord's Supper, 6) the doctrine of the Church, 7) the doctrine of the Ministry, 8) the doctrine of church fellowship, 9) the doctrine of election, 10) the doctrine of universal grace and the election of grace, 11) the doctrine of fundamentals and non-fundamentals, 12) the doctrine of chiliasm, 13) the doctrine of the Antichrist, 14) the doctrine of the conversion of Israel, 15) the question of a resurrection of the martyrs. Then there is also the doctrine of the "rule of faith," and we might even mention the doctrine of Sunday and the doctrine of objective justification, which we have not treated because the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church have permitted the words of the Brief Statement to stand in this respect. Let us not deceive the world and ourselves. If these differences are immaterial and not divisive of fellowship, then let us tell the whole world that we regard them as such and not hide them under ambiguous phraseology. It has rightly been said by Dr. Krauth that truthful separation is far better than dishonest union; for every formula which is dishonest will ultimately breed further dissension and finally destroy the Church.

There is, however, an even more urgent reason for rejecting the Affirmation as our confession of faith.

THE PRINCIPLE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH WHICH ROOM IS MADE THROUGHOUT THE AFFIRMATION FOR MANY FALSE TEACHINGS, VITIATES THE SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLE AND FUNDAMENTALLY SUB-

VERTS THE WHOLE OF THE DOCTRINAL POSITION OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD AND OF THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE.

Will Missouri sell its glorious birthright, God's great gift to our Church, for a mess of unionistic pottage?

HOW TO HEAL THE SCHISM

The way to heal the schism within the Lutheran Church of America is not by way of compromise, by producing a formula of unification which is differently interpreted by the various church bodies. That has been tried again and again. It may have brought about an outward union in some instances, but it has always failed to bring about a true unity. It was tried in the so-called Chicago Theses, of which it was rightly said, "at times they are so phrased that both parties can find in them their own opinions." Then in 1932 our Synod unanimously adopted the Brief Statement as the confession of its faith. The Brief Statement left no room and leaves no room for false doctrine. It was so clearly written that there could be no misunderstanding as to the meaning which the words were to convey. It showed the whole world exactly where we stood and what faith was required of those to whom we would grant the hand of fellowship. Therefore this confession has served as a true expression of the unity not only of the members of the Missouri Synod but also of the Synodical Conference. However, the Brief Statement as such was not acceptable to some outside of the Synodical Conference, and therefore another document, the Declaration, was placed at its side. Now room is being made through the "Doctrinal Affirmation" within the Brief Statement itself for the safeguarding of the peculiar teaching of the Declaration, and what has been the result? Strife and discord within the Missouri Synod and within the Synodical Conference, and we have not been drawn closer to the other Lutheran church bodies.

We believe that there is only one way of promoting true unity of faith within the Lutheran Church of America, and that is through the truth of God's Word. Error, the denial of God's Word, dare not be passed over in silence, but must be refuted publicly and renounced without any reservation whatever. Let the Lutheran pastors of America sit down together and without animosity and prejudice study the Word of God and learn what God's Word teaches on the controverted questions. Then let them take the Brief Statement—not the Affirmation for that document does not speak a clear and unambiguous language—and see whether or not it agrees with Scripture, and whether it clearly sets forth the truth of God's Word in regard to those questions which have been in controversy within the Lutheran Churches of America during the last century. There is no need of haste. Let us never become impatient if we are not immediately successful. Much ignorance and prejudice must first be overcome and removed. It must also be remembered that there are also many in our midst who accept a certain doctrine as true because they heard it from some professor in a seminary, or because they read it in some book. Of course many do not have the time, and there are others who hate to expend the energy, to see if these things are really according to God's Word. Above all, let us see that we never cease to discuss these doctrinal differences freely, openly and objectively in our

synodical publications. Ignoring differences will not remove them, and silence will not indoctrinate any people. In 1922, when our Synod was celebrating the 75th anniversary of its existence, the "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" (Ohio Synod) said, "A characteristic of the Missourian pastors and teachers is that they never, yes, never, become weary of discussing doctrine on the basis of Scripture and Confession. That is one trait of what may be called the 'Spirit of Missouri.' . . . People who thus cling to doctrine and thus contend for its purity are of an altogether different sort than the superficial unionists, who, if necessary, are not very scrupulous. God will bless all those, to whom His Word means so much." Yes, we can rest assured that God's blessing will rest upon such study of His Word. The more diligently we study God's Word the closer will we be drawn together, and finally by the grace of God we actually will be truly united in the faith. That is the task which the Missouri Synod should continue to set for itself as it looks to the second century of its existence.

OUR PLEA

However, we believe that there is also something which we can do as a Synod. In order to promote true unity of faith within the Lutheran Church of America and in order to draw those closer to us who are already united with us in the faith, we believe that we as a Synod should reaffirm our unqualified adherence to the Brief Statement of 1932 as the confession of our faith, and that we should also rescind the resolutions of 1938 in which we declare that the Brief Statement together with the Declaration of the American Lutheran Church and the Report of Committee 16 be regarded as the doctrinal basis for future church fellowship, because the said Declaration is not in harmony with the Scriptural position of the Brief Statement. We believe that we as a Synod should also solemnly declare that we will neither privately nor publicly speak or write anything contrary to the Brief Statement, and that we will grant the hand of Christian fellowship to all those who with us explicitly and unequivocally subscribe to that confession. Then the members of the Missouri Synod and of the Synodical Conference will stand shoulder to shoulder and soon others may join our ranks. Then God's Word and it alone will have gained the victory.